FBIS DAILY REPORT CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 095

16 May 1983

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

DISARMAMENT/START/MBFR

U.S., Soviet Positions at Geneva Talks Discussed AA 1
Arrival Statement AA 1
USSR Stance Set Forth AA 1
Observer Comments on Talks AA 2
U.S. Stance Scored [Zorin] AA 2
Adelman Remarks Hit AA 4
Euromissiles in Balance of Forces Discussed AA 4
Falin Article [IZVESTIYA 16 May] AA 4
Bovin Comment AA 8
Further Bovin Remarks AA 9
Beglov Commentary AA 10
Nuclear 'Dual Control' Issue Discussed AA 11

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

Western Reports of CEMA Conflicts 'Invented' [Yefimov] BB 1

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

Politburo Discusses Results of Visits, Policies [PRAVDA 14 May] CC 1
Weekly 'International Observers Roundtable' [Volskiy, Gerasimov, Sobolev] CC 1
Arms Proposals, Talks CC 1
Europe on U.S. Deployment CC 3
U.S.-Israeli Interests CC 4
U.S. 'Elastic Conscience' in C.A. CC 6
Events, Election in Europe CC 7

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Gorbachev Receives Canadian Envoy, Leaves for Visit A 1
Meets With Ambassador [PRAVDA 13 May] A 1
Gorbachev To Lead Delegation A 1
Delegation Departs A 1
Soviet-U.S. Consultative Commission Session Ends A 1

CHINA

Hu Yaobang: Wish for Normal Relations With USSR B 1
PRC Citizen Sentenced for Spying for U.S. B 1
Briefs: Deng Liqun Article B 1

SOUTH ASIA

Arkhipov Official Visit to India Continues D 1
Joint Cooperation Praised [Bulantsev] D 1
Arkhipov on Oil Refineries D 1
Indian Amity Group Addressed D 3
Arkhipov, Rao Predeparture Statements D 3
Official Visit Concludes D 4
Moscow Condemns U.S. Support for Afghan Rebels D 4
[Olin]

EASTERN EUROPE

USSR-SFRY Sign Program of Cultural Cooperation F 1
Maltsev on Cultural Relations F 1
Agreement Signed in Moscow F 1

WESTERN EUROPE

IZVESTIYA Derides Swedish Sub Report 'Myth' G 1
[Ivanov, 15 May]
Norwegian Radar System Plan Draws Criticism G 2
[Yevdokimov in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 12 May]
27th Congress of Danish Communist Party Held G 3
CPSU Sends Greetings [PRAVDA 12 May] G 3
Soviet Delegation Attends G 4
Soviet Stance on North Europe Peace Zones Cited G 5
[Zubko in IZVESTIYA 13 May]
FRG Official on 4-Day Trade Visit to USSR G 6

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

Further Comment on Shultz Trip, Lebanon Plan H 1
Shultz Cited on Mission H 1
'Difficulties' of Mission Noted H 1
Accord 'Unfair' to Lebanon [Kondrashov] H 2
U.S.-Israeli Interests Served H 3
Plan Called U.S.-Israeli 'Cover' H 4
Syria Rejects Plan [Timoshkin] H 4
Arab Opposition Noted H 5
Israel Said Preparing for 'New Aggression' H 6
TASS Reports 'Arafat Speech on PLO Policy H 7
PLO Radio Reports 'Arafat Message From USSR Leaders H 7
[Baghdad]
Soviet Lebanon Envoy on Nationals' Departure H 7
[Beirut]

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

Angola's Dos Santos in Moscow for Visit J 1
Visit Previewed J 1
Pre-Visit Interview J 1

Arrives in Moscow J 2
U.S., RSA Conducting 'War' Against Angola J 2
[Vasilyev in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 12 May]
Frontline States Hold Dar es Salaam Meeting J 4
[Stepanov]
USSR Council of Ministers' Greetings to UNECA J 5
[PRAVDA 30 Apr]

LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN

Cuban Official Visits USSR Aviation Minister K 1
[IZVESTIYA 13 May]
U.S. Nicaraguan Interference Condemned at UN K 1
[Levchenko]

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

Supreme Soviet Presidium Holds 11 May Session R 1
IZVESTIYA Report [13 May] R 1
Decision on Supreme Soviet Meeting R 4
[PRAVDA 15 May]
Government Environmental Commission Meets 12 May R 4
Valeriy Repin Trial Continues in Leningrad R 4

AGRICULTURAL AFFAIRS

Council of Ministers Views Agricultural Problems T 1
[IZVESTIYA 12 May]
Agricultural Review Details Spring Sowing Work T 2
Nationwide Progress [IZVESTIYA 12 May] T 2
RSFSR Data [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 12 May] T 4
Heavy Rain Washes Away Crops in Tajikistan T 6
[IZVESTIYA 8 May]

MILITARY DEVELOPMENTS

Grishin Attends Air Defense District Meeting V 1
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 6 May]
Ustinov, Romanov Sign Admiral's Obituary V 1
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 7 May]

U.S., SOVIET POSITIONS AT GENEVA TALKS DISCUSSED

Arrival Statement

LD141131 Moscow TASS in English 1112 GMT 14 May 83

[Text] Geneva May 14 TASS -- A Soviet delegation to the Soviet-U.S. talks on the limitation of nuclear weapons in Europe arrived in Geneva today. Upon arrival the delegation's head, Yuriy Kvitsinskiy, made the following statement for the press:

"Soviet-U.S. talks on the limitation of nuclear arms in Europe resume May 17. The situation at the talks is known to remain unnormal. America's 'zero option' obstructed any progress for one-and-a-half years. The so-called 'interim offer' made by the United States not so long ago does not mean any positive change in the U.S. stand, as its aim is to deploy new U.S. missiles in Western Europe and to make the Soviet Union reduce its arms unilaterally. Of course, the Soviet Union will never agree to such an unjust solution which contradicts the interests of European nations."

"There exists a realistic road to an honest and equitable accord. The groundwork for it has been laid by Soviet proposals. This is a radical reduction of nuclear arms in Europe and the maintenance of approximate parity between the Soviet Union and NATO both in medium-range delivery vehicles of nuclear weapons and in the number of warheads they carry. It should be noted that such parity would be (maintained) [TASS parentheses] at a notably lower level than today, and the Soviet Union would have in the European zone notably fewer medium-range missiles and warheads than prior to 1976. The attitude to this far-reaching offer of the Soviet Union is a touchstone for assessing the true objectives and intentions of the United States and NATO and their readiness for concrete steps to limit nuclear arms in Europe. The Soviet Union stands for an agreement, and is doing everything for its part to attain it. A constructive approach is needed on the part of the United States."

USSR Stance Set Forth

LD142039 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1215 GMT 14 May 83

[From "International Review" Program presented by Viktor Mikheyev]

[Text] Last week, in Comrade Andropov's answers, the Soviet Union authoritatively reaffirmed the fundamental principles of its peace-loving foreign policy and once again recalled our aspiration to do all that is necessary to lessen the risk of a nuclear conflict and, in the final analysis, to make it completely impossible.

If the United States and its partners were to follow our proposal to radically reduce in Europe the medium-range nuclear missiles to 300 launch platforms, 16 missiles -- the number of French and British missiles targeted on our country -- and 138 nuclear aircraft on their side and on ours, the threat of a nuclear catastrophe for Europe would significantly diminish. Meanwhile, the United States and NATO do not even give an answer as to whether they agree to a strict equality of nuclear forces or if they will persist stubbornly with their plans to create a superiority over the Soviet Union, superiority through Reagan's zero and intermediate options. But the aspiration to superiority remains for the time being the aim of both NATO and the U.S. policy. The NATO countries and the United States are dodging the obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons and the obligation to abandon use of force in international relations. Why are they dodging this -- how should one understand this? Are the United States and NATO preparing to be the first to use military force and nuclear weapons? Is that the case? Surely they know they must not and cannot rely on getting away with it now. The time is long past when the aggressor could rely on getting away with it.

Observer Comments on Talks

LD152128 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 15 May 83

[From the Vremya newscast; talk by political observer Igor Fesunenko]

[Text] Hello, comrades. The Geneva talks have already been going on for 18 months, but the results have been practically equal to zero. The reason for this lies with the frank aim of the American side to move away from achieving agreement in order to thus obtain a pretext for the deployment of new first-strike missiles on the territory of its European allies.

In the course of the entire 18 months since the Geneva talks have been in progress, the Soviet Union has been offering realistic, concrete proposals that take into account the interests of both sides for a radical reduction in the medium-range nuclear armaments of the USSR and the United States in Europe. It was proposed, and is still being proposed, to maintain constantly an absolutely equal level of these armaments for the two sides -- for the USSR and NATO.

In response to each of the Soviet proposals, Washington invented -- with exemplary persistence -- further excuses such as the notorious so-called zero or intermediate options. When Washington was unable to invent an excuse with even the slightest credibility, promises were made that the Soviet proposal will be so-called carefully examined.

Speaking on 3 May at a Kremlin dinner in honor of a GDR party and state delegation, Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov stated the readiness of our country to maintain both missiles and warheads in numbers no greater than those possessed by the NATO side in each mutually agreed period. Furthermore, the USSR is ready to apply this approach not only with respect to missiles, but also to medium-range airborne delivery systems based in Europe.

The implementation of this proposal, noted the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, would mean that there would be in the European part of the Soviet Union significantly fewer medium-range missiles and warheads than in the period prior to 1976, when we did not have the SS-20 missiles.

Once again, in response to this proposal, Washington is giving assurances of readiness to study and consider it. At the same time, under the cover of such assurances, feverish preparations are continuing for the deployment of new American nuclear missiles in Western Europe. A question logically arises: Is it not high time Washington stops this maneuvering and begins to use the Geneva talks as a means to achieve an agreement that is needed by the West no less than by the Soviet Union? On our part, everything necessary toward this objective has been done. Now it is the U.S. turn.

U.S. Stance Scored

LD151014 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 14 May 83

[Valentin Zorin commentary]

[Text] Official Washington has lately been trying harder than ever to persuade Americans and world public opinion that it is sincerely striving to achieve progress at the Soviet-U.S. talks and a just solution of the problems that divide us. According to the men in Washington, the only obstacle preventing positive results at the talks and in general the removal of the threat of war is, you see, the intransigence of the Soviet Union, which refuses to accept just and sensible U.S. proposals.

We have explained time and again why those proposals do not seem just and sensible to the USSR, and why this country contends that what the current U.S. Administration wants to achieve at the current talks between the two countries is the Soviet Union's unilateral disarmament and the elimination of the existing balance of forces in favor of the United States.

I would not like now to repeat the arguments that we have all along been presenting. Instead, I will try to approach the issue from another angle, and draw the attention of our listeners not to a comparison of the number of nuclear missiles and warheads, but rather to the clear-cut discrepancy that manifests itself in the policy aims publicly proclaimed by the Washington administration. On the one hand it tries to convince the public that it is full of good will and wants to reach mutually acceptable agreement with the Soviet Union. But on the other hand, right at the very same time, the most high-ranking officials of the Republican administration proclaim nothing less than the destruction of communism as their aim. As one can easily see, the discrepancy is a glaring one. Either the current top men in Washington want normal relations between our countries or its (?attempt) of an all-out struggle against communism. There cannot be any third way. Some of you might think that I am exaggerating when I say that the aim proclaimed by the present top men in Washington is that of destroying communism. But let us recall that when Mr Reagan was addressing the British Parliament less than a year ago he urged confrontation with the socialist world and active interference in its internal affairs so as to change the existing system in the socialist countries. And he plainly stated that the aim of this policy was that of achieving a march of freedom and democracy that would leave Marxism-Leninism on the ash heap of history. So as you can see, the head of the current U.S. Administration quite unequivocally proclaimed in what direction he wants to march.

What the President said was not a chance statement made in the heat of polemics, for if you examine quite a number of statements made by Ronald Reagan, beginning with his address at Notre Dame University, Indiana, and ending with his recent speech in Orlando, Florida, where he publicly proclaimed the Soviet Union the focus of evil, you will see that this is hardly a case of exercises in rhetoric, but rather a basic concept of America's current President. From year to year and speech to speech he and his closest associates speak of the need to fight against the Soviet Union and its ideology. Judging from everything, precisely these concepts reflect the genuine views of America's current leaders.

So, the question inevitably arises: If the current top men in Washington regard the Soviet Union as the focus of evil in the present-day world, then how can they sincerely conduct talks and strive to normalize relations with those whom they regard as embodying that evil? Equally significant is another question facing the Soviet public. Can one really trust at negotiations people who speak of their good will and desire to find just solutions for outstanding issues, while at the same time are planning a march to destroy the Soviet social system, and who regard this country as a focus of evil, and the Soviet people as people who are embodying that evil?

Just put yourself in our place and you will understand why the Soviet Union regards with suspicion the good will statements coming out from time to time from official Washington, statements which have a clearly propaganda character. Of course, there would be nothing terrible if it was just a case of dislike by the Republican administration's leaders of the ideas of Marxism-Leninism or the system existing in this country, just as there is nothing dangerous for the cause of peace in the fact that we here regard as unjust a system where the fruits of labor by the overwhelming majority are reaped by a limited few. But when ideological differences are taken into the area of actual policies and military strategy, and that's precisely what the top men in the Reagan administration are doing, that all becomes dangerous for the destinies of mankind. We couldn't care less about the labels that Mr Reagan is trying to tag on us. We contend that that practice humiliates only those who resort to the foul rhetoric and abuse.

However, the repeatedly made statements presenting the ideological credo of the current administration are causing the most serious doubts among the Soviet people as to the sincerity of that administration at the current talks, doubts as to its desire for normal relations between our two countries.

Adelman Remarks Hit

LD131424 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 13 May 83

[Text] Washington intends to continue taking an openly obstructionist and unrealistic stand at the nuclear armaments limitation talks. This has been very clearly confirmed by Kenneth Adelman, the new director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. Speaking to the House of Representatives Armed Services Committee he declared, among other things, that in the view of the Reagan administration, the most desirable outcome of the Geneva talks on the limitation of nuclear armaments in Europe would be the notorious zero option. It is well known that this is nothing but an attempt to unilaterally disarm the Soviet Union, which is confronted on the European Continent by NATO's huge nuclear potential.

EUROMISSILES IN BALANCE OF FORCES DISCUSSED

Falin Article

PM152141 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 May 83 Morning Edition p 3

[IZVESTIYA political observer V. Falin article under the rubric "Discussion on a Topical Theme": "Splitting Policy"]

[Text] First let us dot the "i's."

The existence of British and French nuclear weapons is an indisputable fact of significance for the international alignment of forces. France and Britain are members of the North Atlantic alliance and they shape their military activity and plans so as to conform with their commitments to their bloc allies, which is another fact to be taken into consideration. A third indisputable fact is that Britain and France are at the moment remaining aloof from the nuclear arms negotiations and they oppose the renunciation of first use of nuclear weapons, that is, they lay claim to the active and totally unrestricted use of the "nuclear trump card" in the interests of their policy. And finally, it is a fact that the Soviet Union and the United States are trying to reach agreement only on their own weapons which are confronting each other; they do not speak for all and everything [ne vystupayut za vsekh i vsya] and do not intend to encroach on the sovereignty of Britain and France.

Perhaps that is so, Paris and London observe -- if an abstract view of reality is taken. But what if one takes a look from the French or British "window of vulnerability?" The picture is then different. And the world looks quite different when viewed from the height of one's own majesty, from the angle of political egoism.

France is "sole mistress of its deterrent forces" and for this reason the demands for their inclusion "in the overall tally is strategically unfounded," C. Cheysson, the minister of external relations, asserts. In his words, "the inclusion of the forces of third parties in the calculations at the Geneva talks would be a catastrophic deception."

Permit me to point out: Is not the Soviet Union master of its own deterrent forces? It is not rumored that the command of the American forces should be subcontracted to someone else. Why then must the nuclear facilities of the USSR and the United States go into the reckoning, but the extension of the norms of common sense to France (and Britain) would be "a deception" and, moreover, a "catastrophic" one?

C. Cheysson tries to parry the awkward question by asking another: "Who would believe that the French forces pose a threat to the security of the Soviet Union?" Possibly such rhetoric will produce an impression on the American reader to whom the minister is addressing himself. But it can hardly dupe a Soviet person.

It is no threat? But, excuse me, who is pursuing a "policy of deterrence"? Or have they learned verbal anesthetization and can henceforth deter without threats? Defense Minister C. Hernu is frankly inspired by the "unpredictability" of the use of the French "deterrent forces." He is impressed by the approach of the present U.S. rulers for whom unpredictability is a method of keeping those who surround them in a state of permanent tension so that no one will dare to stick his head up, and also in order to wear down tomorrow's enemy by uncertainty about today. The differences between U.S. and French unpredictability are quantitative, but in no way qualitative.

The Soviet Union did not rejoice when the United States had "only" 300 atom bombs and when it was proposed, in accordance with the "charioteer" plan, to destroy "only" 70 Soviet cities, and then not all at once. Today we are not enraptured by the fact that "only" 434 nuclear warheads are installed on French and British missiles targeted against the socialist countries and that it is planned to triple the number by the mid-nineties (instead of a three-fold reduction on a mutual basis by the end of the current decade, as the USSR is proposing).

But let us listen further to what C. Cheysson and C. Hernu, and M. Thatcher, head of the British Cabinet, and F. Pym, the foreign secretary, have to say.

The nuclear forces of France and Britain are "strategic weapons," they assure us, and have nothing to do with the talks on medium-range weapons. They do not have any bearing on the talks on the limitation and reduction of strategic arms insofar as they are the "minimum" forces necessary for "effective strategic deterrence." They are the "last bulwark" of Britain (F. Pym). Sometime in the future, "if substantial changes" (which particular changes are left unspecified) "occur in the present situation," London might join in the discussion of the problem of strategic weapons control and would place its own potential in the scalepan. Perhaps.

And Paris? It is opposed in principle to "overall tallies." "France will not change its stance with respect to its own nuclear arms whatever proposals the Soviet Union may make and whatever accords the participants in the talks on nuclear arms reduction may arrive at," President F. Mitterrand declared on 5 May. Surely all the others should disarm first. He himself is opposed and he wants the others to be opposed too. C. Cheysson warns Washington that it would weaken ~~its positions by recognizing~~ as acceptable for itself a "smaller number of missiles than the Russians possess, at least by as many units as France and Britain, put together, possess."

The talks on nuclear weapons in Europe are not to France's and Britain's liking. The talks on strategic weapons do not suit them. And in general they like it that way. They find it convenient. They do not even have to alter from time to time the repertoire in the theater of the absurd. Yes, absurd. For the discussions about whether or not to take into account the forces of third countries at the negotiations on maintaining the nuclear balance in Europe are basically untenable. It is a question at these talks not of Soviet-U.S. parity in Europe, but of general European security and balance which are made up from all the component parts. There is no need to count a single weapon twice. But it must be counted once and most scrupulously, without tricks and deception.

The French and British take into account, de facto, the Soviet nuclear weapons, although they are not negotiating with the USSR. And they also allow others to follow their own example!

In their own -- NATO -- circle, neither proud Albion nor the obstinate Gallic rooster want to appear as albinos [allusion unclear] . Reserving a special status for themselves and insisting on a "balance" that is unequal for the Soviet Union, they look after "Atlantic interests." The nuclear warheads on Britain's and France's missiles are the West's reserve.

F. Pym openly declares: "Our deterrent forces are a compnent of NATO forces." He could have added that the targets for the British (and likewise the French) missiles are prescribed by the nuclear targets assignment center in the U.S. city of Omaha. The London government's White Paper (1981) set down in print: "We maintain modern nuclear forces earmarked for use in the context of NATO's flexible response strategy and capable of inflicting such damage on the Soviet Union that the Soviet leaders have to take them into account." On 11 March 1982 M. Thatcher pledged in a letter the the U.S. President to attach the Trident 2 complexes to NATO when they are deployed and to use them "for purposes of international defense of the Western alliance under any circumstances." A very positive reserve, there's no denying. French figures express themselves in a similar vein. France is a "country that stands firmly with the United States, with our allies, and with our European partners" (C. Cheysson). "In fact," C. Hernu states, "we could not visualize any defense that would not permit us at any convenient moment from displaying in concrete terms our solidarity with those who trust us."

And after bravura chords glorifying their allied duty, one is presented with the news that the nuclear forces of Britain and France are earmarked... "solely" for the defense of British and French territory. These forces, C. Cheysson says, polemicizing with himself, are not tasked at present, nor in the future will they be tasked, with "ensuring defense of the entire European zone of the Atlantic alliance." "Only the command of the allied NATO armed forces, "the minister stressed, "in other words, in point of fact, the United States, can provide a guarantee for the European territories not posessing nuclear weapons." But C. Hernu continues to stick to his own line, to "deterrence" in the broad sense and talks about determination to "wholly and completely discharge one's responsibilities to the allies," including the FRG. Whom does one believe? One has to believe the facts.

In British mouths, the words "independent nuclear potential" have an even more cynical ring to them. The state, which was the first in Europe to accomodate U.S. nuclear weapons, the state which is, as it were, pock-marked with U.S. military installations and which has now opened its arms to recieve cruise missiles, wants to emerge unscathed. Let us suppose that the United States used one of the bases in Britain for a strike against a third country. Well, will Britain make the entreaty that it is uninvolved in this and by dint of its "independence" must avoid retribution? And even if it should make this entreaty in desperate terms, who will believe it? If one poses this very simple question, the "independence" house of cards collapses completely.

However, M. Thatcher and her ministers are unabashed by this. They make one announcement about "solidarity" and one announcement about "special" national concerns. Or else they fly into a temper to such a degree that they bawl out the neutrals -- its NATO allies are not enough for London -- who also have to be taken under their military protection, although they do not ask for this.

These are the kind of intricacies that are concocted and you cannot get to the bottom of them straight away. But they have to be investigated, in all earnestness, proceeding from the principles of interstate relations which have been sanctified by centuries. One cannot demand respect for one's sovereignty while disdaining the sovereignty of someone else. One cannot demand respect for one's own security while scoring the security of others. In a nutshell, reciprocity is needed, without which tyranny holds sway in the world instead of law. Nowadays security is only reciprocal, or, to use a modern expression, collective. It can be ensured most reliably jointly, worse, separately, and still worse, in antagonism. To judge by opinion polls, that is what the majority of people on earth believe. But not everyone.

Nuclear weapons "guarantee" peace, the French president declares. "The demand, sometimes expressed in the United States that one should pledge to renounce first use of nuclear weapons," says C. Cheysson, sounding the alarm, "seriously undermines the bonds of solidarity in the defense sphere and consequently, our security." And this is passed off, incidentally, as political clear-headedness.

It is of no consequence to the socialist countries what a missile is called -- MX or Peacekeeper -- or whether it will be listed officially as strategic or medium-range. Neither is the color of the flag marked on a nuclear warhead a matter of prime importance. The decisive factor is that the weapon has been created, placed in position, its combat assignment programmed into its targeting system -- and all that remains to be done for hell to break loose is to press a button. It is not just for prestige that Britain and France are perfecting nuclear weapons and expanding the arsenals of nuclear weapons as they see fit. Everyone who should know does know this and realizes what is what. What kind of reservations can there be here? Only facts come into the reckoning here.

It is more difficult to split policy than it is to split the atom; on even-numbered days you pursue one policy -- a policy of "solidarity" -- and on odd-numbered days you pursue a different one -- "a sovereign-independent" one. Unpredictability is a vice rather than a virtue of policy. In order that trust may emerge you have to know whom you are dealing with and not have to expect some dirty trick either now, tomorrow, or the day after. Detente was built on this, and on this basis accords were successfully reached which -- however many holes may be picked in them by those who favor strong-arm methods -- made the world more stable.

Allusions to the fact that Atlantic defense has grown thin and that it is impossible to cement allied bonds without moving U.S. strategic missiles up close to the borders of the Warsaw Pact countries is a moldy dish served up to the gullible. The new element in the situation is the increasingly active involvement of France in publicizing the dangerous venture of the NATO "dual decision" and in conditioning the nonnuclear countries of this bloc. Paris is now making intimidating noises: If you don't accept the U.S. missiles you have only yourselves to blame; you will not get a helping hand. And what are the other nonnuclear countries, which have not yet been entered in the list of hostages, to do? Or are they nevertheless to be sent nuclear succor from on high? And if this group of states is sent this succor, then for what reason have Belgium, the Netherlands, the FRG, and Italy fallen into disgrace?

Common sense is being jeered at, the U.S. first-strike weapons being passed off as an expression of Washington's allied diligence, while the clank of the chains with which the crusaders want to tether the West Europeans to their war chariot as they venture upon a new campaign for a pax Americana is passed off as the sound of the Liberty Bell. What are those who succumb to the deception hoping for? Retribution will inevitably follow. It will be fully appropriate, let there be no doubt about it. Pick up a pencil and count up. They want to bring 48 cruise missiles each into Belgium and the Netherlands, each with a 200=kiloton warhead, 160 into Britain and then again into the FRG and Italy. And what about the 10,000 kilotons in response for Belgium or the 30,000 kilotons for Britain? What about the 500 and 1,500 Hiroshimas respectively? In an evening of playing roulette you can say goodbye to a fortune, while in nuclear roulette you can say goodbye to your life in minutes.

In certain NATO capitals people indulge in dodging and falsification beyond measure. And trembling with impatience they turn over the pages of the calendar -- let autumn come as quickly as possible, let's get the missiles into position as quickly as possible and stop the pretense. Let's start breaking up the strategic situation in the world. And in the meantime, separately and conjointly, let's put wrenches in the works of the nuclear arms talks.

An accord on nuclear arms is possible. In Europe, as Comrade Yu.V. Andropov stressed once again, it would be possible to agree on establishing the number of missiles, aircraft and nuclear warheads on both sides, taking into account, naturally, the arms of Britain and France, too, at an equally low level, and on this number being consistently reduced in the future. The implementation of this Soviet proposal would bring Europe substantially closer to complete riddance of nuclear weapons, both medium-range and tactical. Only someone who wants to smash the balance of forces that has taken shape can refuse to accept this proposal. The Soviet Union cannot allow this and will take the necessary steps to ensure that parity is maintained.

Bovin Comment

LD151716 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 15 May 83

[From the "International Panorama" Program, presented by IZVESTIYA political observer Aleksandr Bovin]

[Excerpt] Hello, comrades. Perhaps the main political theme of the past week was that of the Euro-strategic missiles. The latest round of talks in Geneva should begin the day after tomorrow. The latest Soviet initiatives, which were formulated by Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov and which you are all well-acquainted with, create a situation that is favorable for an agreement there. However, reaching an agreement means finding some sort of compromise, a mutually acceptable decision taking into equal account the lawful interests of each country. The search for a compromise presupposes as a minimum that the partners want to strive for this. If one has the Americans in mind, big doubts immediately arise. First of all, the search for a compromise is being hindered by the general direction of U.S. foreign policy, which is rigidly orientated at forceful opposition [silovoye protivoborstvo] in confrontation wih the Soviet Union. Hence proceeds the unambiguous striving to break the nuclear missile parity and ensure that the United States has the possibility of a victory in, as they put it, a nuclear missile war.

Proud superiority is a main new component part of U.S. security policy. These very words -- proud superiority -- belong to Reed, one of the White House advisers. If one is to believe THE NEW YORK TIMES newspaper, the President personally approved the remark by Mr Reed.

The question arises: If one country strives to achieve superiority over another, can it concurrently strive for a compromise, toward a balance of interests and equal security? This is highly questionable.

In the second place, it is usual in the West to see the idea of deployment of American missiles as a response to the deployment of our SS-20 missiles. However, the facts tell a completely different story. The contract for the creation of a new missile for the theater of military operations was signed by the Pentagon with the (Martin Orland) company as early as February 1969 -- so it has evidently nothing to do with the SS-20. The Pentagon intended and intends to deploy the new missiles irrespective of any talks. A first-strike strategic weapon is what the Americans need here. Although they conceal this in every way and do not want to talk about it, they are generally looking for a way of separating the defense of the United States from the defense of Western Europe. These words by Reagan are well-known: a limited nuclear war in Europe would not necessarily grow into a world war if the Soviet Union is convinced that the United States is capable of destroying the USSR. Well, with that sort of approach, a compromise is clearly not needed. Furthermore, none of the American variations, as you know, takes into account the presence of the British and French potentials. Both Paris and London object to this.

Further Bovin Remarks

LD152317 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 15 May 83

[From the "International Panorama" Program presented by IZVESTIYA political observer Aleksandr Bovin]

[Text] International Panorama asked Vitaliy Ilyashchenko to conduct an interview on the theme of arms control. Watch and listen please:

[Begin video recording; caption identifies interviewee as Ray Whitney, chairman of Britain's Conservative Party's Foreign Affairs Committee; in English with superimposed translation]

[Question] Some politicians in Britain evaluate the Soviet proposals as a step forward in the talks on disarmament. What can you say about this?

[Answer] I consider them very interesting and we welcome these proposals. We must study them very carefully. We particularly welcome the proposal by Yuriy Andropov and the Soviet Government about the fact that the disarmament talks must take into account not the number of missiles but the number of nuclear warheads.

[Question] But why did the British Government turn down the proposal to take into account at the talks the British nuclear potential?

[Answer] Ah, that is a different question. As I have said, we welcome the Soviet viewpoint regarding the number of warheads. This is important. But the question of British nuclear forces goes beyond the framework of talks on the reduction of medium-range missiles. Our missiles are a strategic weapon. I am sure that the British Government would welcome talks on strategic nuclear weapons. But questions of medium-range missiles are being discussed at the Geneva talks, as is known. The question of defining the category of missiles is a very complex issue. We consider that specialists should be engaged in this and discuss this at the Geneva talks.

[Question] Does the British Government intend to hold talks on reducing its nuclear forces?

[Answer] I cannot speak for the British Government, but I am sure that when discussion of strategic nuclear weapons begins, it would be correct to pose the question of British missiles too. But we must not forget that we have only four submarines with missiles, that our nuclear forces are only an insignificant element of the total nuclear potential. [end recording]

Now let us try to pick out the arguments from what Mr Whitney was saying. There are basically two.

The first is that British missiles are a strategic weapon and not of the medium-range weapon kind which are being discussed at Geneva. The second is that the British have few missiles and the Russians have incomparably more. Well, let us see.

Of course, in the present case classification is of no significance for us whatever. British weapons, just as our Euromissiles, are outside the limits of the strategic balance set up between the Soviet Union and the United States, and if our Euromissiles are to be taken into account, then we cannot close our eyes to what is in British and French arsenals. The fundamental fact for the Soviet Union is that both the British and French weapons are aimed at us and can reach our territory, and thus any reasonable variant must without fail take this fact into account.

Now, as regards evaluations of numbers, it would be right to take into account in comparison not the whole of our strategic arsenal as they do in Paris and London, but only its Euro-strategic part, and then the picture would be different. This is how the matter stands as regards these arguments.

And, finally, comrades, who is conducting talks with us? At the head of the U.S. delegation is Paul Nitze, a man of indisputable experience, competent and with a long career behind him. But it is difficult to include him in the number of, so to speak, enthusiasts of disarmament. For example, he told journalists that serious talks with the Soviet Union could be held only after the United States has increased its forces. He was asked when this would be -- in 10 years, Nitze answered. Well, those are the current prospects. And these prospects will not be brighter following the appointment of Kenneth Adelman to the post of director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. Senator Cranston commented on this appointment as follows: Now more than ever there is cause to fear that the administration sees the talks as a trick meant to calm the just anxiety of the public and at the same time to provide a screen for endless military spending.

And another figure, Richard Perle, that is, assistant secretary of defense on questions of security -- this is what THE WASHINGTON POST wrote about this man: Perle is inclined to view arms control as a narcotic spread by the Russians with the aim of inducing drowsiness in the United States. Perle always prefers those measures which demand a reduction on the side of the Russians and at the same time leave our country with all variants intact and inviolable.

Just try talking to them about compromises. In general, of course, our comrades in Geneva will not find it an easy task. The Soviet Union is ready to go its half of the way, but whether the West is ready for this, whether the United States is ready for this, the next few months will answer this question.

Beglov Commentary

LD122348 Moscow World Service in English 1600 GMT 12 May 83

[Spartak Beglov commentary]

[Text] If we apply the old aphorism that truth is the first casualty to today's problem of reducing military arsenals, it will be clear that truth and elementary human logic are falling victim to a kind of nuclear chauvinism. Witness how the United States, Britain, France, and the entire North Atlantic Treaty Organization are reacting to the simple Soviet proposal on nuclear disarmament in Europe. The Soviet Union says this: New swings in the missile race can be prevented, and the number of missiles can be reduced to a minimum on both sides, if it is settled that the Soviet Union retains no more nuclear weapons in the European zone than NATO does. Then the Americans will not need to station there their Pershing-II's and cruise missiles, and the Soviet Union will maintain as many of its medium-range missiles as Britain and France taken together have, that is, 162 missiles. The remaining SS-20 missiles will be removed from the scene.

However, the Governments of Britain and France have emerged on the scene in the posture of those who were grossly mistaken. Both of them claim that their missiles can by no means be taken into account in the general balance of military confrontation between the East and West. The famous British common sense and French logic seem to have disappeared, because the Soviet Union is expected to view as nonexistent the 400 nuclear warheads which are much more destructive than the atomic bomb dropped on Hiroshima and which are targeted on the Soviet Union and subjected to constant modernization. It is common knowledge that in the absence of logic and common sense the only escape is sophistry. And that is what London and Paris have turned to. London declared its missiles untouchable in the last resort. Paris objects to its missiles being taken into account because it views them as an autonomous force.

But will the Russians suffer less if they are hit by the missiles called the last resort or by those belonging to an autonomous force? Let us then pretend that I am on the Soviet side of the negotiating table and tell the Americans and their British and French clients this: Okay, if you insist that the British and the French missiles are untouchable, I declare that from now on 162 SS-20 missiles will be singled out in the Soviet arsenal as a special unit and be called an autonomous force of last resort in case someone in Britain or France decides to press the fatal button. Who will then dare to say that the other side has no right to answer accordingly?

I would be better still if Mrs Thatcher and her advisers looked through the White Papers on defense questions issued by the Government of Her Majesty in 1981 and 1982. They would see written there that Britain's nuclear arsenal is an integral part of the theater nuclear forces and that Britain intends to increase its contribution to NATO's nuclear deterrent. In 1982 London asked the United States to supply it with missiles of a new, Trident-2, type instead of Polarises. What for? For the quickest delivery of Christmas presents to Russian children? Hardly for that. Britain's request was supplemented by the assurance that these powerful missiles, capable of destroying all the major population centers in the Soviet Union's European part in one launch, will belong to NATO and will be used whenever it becomes necessary in the framework of the NATO strategy. The same is implied in political statements issued by Paris in substantiation of its tireless modernization of France's nuclear arsenal. The conclusion is obvious. The time has come to stop the sophistry of missile chauvinism which Washington is only too pleased to use in its efforts to frustrate the talks and to station its new nuclear weapons at all costs.

NUCLEAR 'DUAL CONTROL' ISSUE DISCUSSED

LD142051 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1215 GMT 14 May 83

[From "International Panorama" Program presented by Viktor Mikheyev]

[Text] The past week, 7-14 May, was a week of action for security and cooperation in Europe. It was held in the framework of the world campaign for disarmament proclaimed by the United Nations. The European peace supporters are becoming increasingly active against the deployment on the territory of West European countries, of American medium-range nuclear missiles, which constitute first-strike weapons and which will be under the control of the American military, and which the Europeans are afraid to trust to them. In Britain progressive figures are demanding a so-called second key, which means that the American cruise missiles deployed in Britain, 160 in all, should be under the dual control of the United States and Britain, so that the Americans should not provoke at their own discretion a limited nuclear war in West Europe. In West Europe the peace supporters understand that the deployment of American missiles on their soil will only increase the risk of nuclear conflict.

After all the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Treaty member countries would once again have to take effective measures to restore parity and a just balance in nuclear armaments, the number of missiles and aircraft. This has already happened on more than one occassion, when in its mad aspiration to achieve military superiority the United States began new rounds in the arms race, new rounds of confrontation -- it has happened a score of times. NATO members should remember, although they conceal this from the [illegible] despite our warnings, they once deployed against the USSR forward-based [illegible] West Europe. The Soviet Union quickly responded to this threat. [illegible] weapons to restrain the American-NATO threat, including the SS-20 missile, which NATO fears more than anything. Then the USSR warned NATO in good time not to create a Euro-strategic threat aimed at us, as it still would not achieve superiority. They did not listen to us and again it seems that they do not want to hear the (?honest) warning: Do not attempt again to violate the military balance in Europe. Nothing will come of it; you will not achieve military superiority.

WESTERN REPORTS OF CEMA CONFLICTS 'INVENTED'

LD132358 Moscow TASS in English 1932 GMT 13 May 83

[Text] Moscow May 13 TASS -- TASS commentator Igor Yefimov writes:

In the past few weeks some western publications grant attention to the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance, the main international organization of the socialist countries, the accomplishments of which those publications stubbornly sought to hush up. But it would be naive to believe that the reader has got, at last, an objective picture of economic cooperation of the socialist states. They started writing about the CMEA since it is, as they say, "rent with conflict". THE NEW YORK TIMES, for instance, dramatically narrated a few days ago "profound differences", "begot by prices on Soviet oil" and other problems. The differences, the newspaper asserts, are so great that an economic summit conference of socialist countries had to be postponed.

Well, the picture is horrible. The CMEA is to disintegrate if not today but tomorrow.

It should be stated right away: The foes of socialism are engaged in wishful thinking. Integration in the socialist community is successfully developing, and the CMEA is fruitfully discharging the task laid on it.

The process of international division of labour between the CMEA member-countries is perfecting, socialist countries are jointly implementing programmes unprecedented in the practice of the capitalist world -- development of the atomic power engineering, production of robots, microelectronic equipment. Trunk oil and gas pipelines are being built, joint power grids are successfully functioning. About 10 meetings of industrial commissions and other CMEA organizations are to be held this month alone. In brief, fruitful planned work is under way in CMEA, and the non-existent "problem of prices of oil", being swelled by anti-socialist propaganda, is no obstacle to it.

As to these prices, they really changed. The CMEA members conduct accounts with due consideration for world prices. But the system of price formation, the use in making accounts of their collective currency, transferable rouble, but not dollar, make it possible to make up for sharp leaps in world prices. CMEA partners purchase from the Soviet Union oil at a lower price than in the world market. In 1981, for instance, it was about half of the world price.

This is admitted even by specialists who are far from sympathetic to socialism. Thus, the journal of the British business circles ECONOMIST wrote in its issue of May 22, 1982, that for East European countries Soviet oil and raw materials were annually cheaper by 5,000-6,000 million dollars in the middle of 1970's, and by 10,000 million dollars -- in 1979 and 22,000 million -- in 1980.

And now about "postponement" of an economic summit conference, which is presented by Western propaganda with special relish. The idea of holding such a conference was supported by all fraternal countries. CMEA's main programmatic document -- a comprehensive programme of socialist economic integration, which acts since the beginning of 1970's, has mainly been fulfilled. It is necessary to take strategic decisions pertaining to economic cooperation till the end of the 20th century. This, naturally, calls for thorough and long preparation. It is going on according to plan and is under direct control of the Central Committees of the ruling parties of the socialist countries.

It is to be added that the mechanism of consultations between CMEA member countries is not limited to the summit meeting. CMEA sessions at the level of heads of government are held every year. Their deputies regularly meet at sessions of the CMEA Executive Committee, while ministers [meet] at sessions of industrial commissions.

Bilateral meetings, including summit meetings, are being held. Early in May, for instance, negotiations were held in Moscow between general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Yuriy Andropov and general secretary of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, Chairman of the State Council of the GDR Erich Honecker. They discussed a broad range of problems, including economic cooperation. The sides declared the determination to actively promote the deepening of socialist economic integration. The leaders of the two countries expressed confidence that the coming summit economic conference of the CMEA member-countries will usher in a new stage in their fruitful many-sided cooperation.

Such is the real situation, as to the date of the conference, it is once and again invented by some Western journalists so as to later discover "a breach" and release another sensation on "discord" in the socialist community.

This method is as old as it is unscrupulous.

POLITBURO DISCUSSES RESULTS OF VISITS, POLICIES

PM131910 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 May 83 First Edition p 1

[Text] Moscow 13 May -- The Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee at its regular meeting has discussed the results of the official friendly visit of a party and state delegation of the German Democratic Republic led by Comrade E. Honecker to the USSR in May.

Having approved the talks conducted by a Soviet party and state delegation led by Comrade Yu.V. Andropov with the GDR leaders, the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee noted that the friendly visit, talks and meetings of the leaders of the two fraternal parties and states would contribute to the further deepening and development of close and lasting ties between the Soviet Union and the GDR in every field of the party, state, economic and social life on the basis of the principles of Marxism and Leninism and socialist internationalism. These ties are an important factor in accomplishing the tasks of building socialism and communism in both countries, strengthening the community of socialist states and consolidating peace and security in Europe.

The combative unity of the CPSU and the SED and their interaction, pervaded with comradely trust and characterized by coincidence of views on all major issues of our time, constitute the motive force of fraternal cooperation between our countries.

This unity of fraternal parties and states and the joint struggle of socialist countries for improving the international situation and for disarmament and peace constitute a real alternative to the imperialist course of political and military confrontation and escalation of the arms race.

The meeting of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee considered and approved Comrade A.A. Gromyko's report on his meetings with Venezuelan Foreign Minister Jose Zambrano.

A report by Comrade P.N. Demichev on the participation of the CPSU delegation in the work of the Fourth Congress of Frelimo in Mozambique held last April was heard.

The Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee also discussed a number of other questions of domestic and foreign policies.

WEEKLY 'INTERNATIONAL OBSERVERS ROUNDTABLE'

LD151830 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1130 GMT 15 May 83

["International Observers Roundtable" program with Dmitriy Antonovich Volskiy, member of the NOVOYE VREMYA editorial board; Gennadiy Ivanovich Gerasimov, political observer of NOVOSTI news agency; and Vitaliy Sergeyevich Sobolev, All-Union Radio commentator]

Arms Proposals, Talks

[Text] [Sobolev] Hello, comrades. I suppose that in our talk today we will have to give Europe its due place, though events in the Middle East and Central America are taking an ever more critical turn and, of course, also merit attention. However, let us begin with Europe. Last week, we were reminded by the 38th anniversary of victory over fascism — in a war where the main battles took place on the European Continent -- of how important it is for the entire world to have an atmosphere of peace and friendship here.

Now, we have just seen the end of the week of action for security and cooperation in Europe, which was held in the framework of the worldwide campaign for disarmament proclaimed by the United Nations. We have a thoroughly developed program for strengthening security in Europe, contained in the Soviet proposals expounded this week by Comrade Andropov in his replies to respresentatives of a number of Finnish public organizations.

Since 1946, the Soviet Union has been urging the cessation of production and the banning of nuclear weapons -- a ban including Europe. We are now proposing a radical reduction of medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe from the present level of 1,000, in the possession of each country, to 300. We are also willing to agree on equality based on both carriers and warheads -- counting, of course, the corresponding armaments possessed by Britain and France. As one measure to strengthen European security, the Soviet Union supports the establishment of nuclear-free zones in the north of the continent and in other areas.

[Volskiy] In our policy, regional nuclear-free zones -- for example, as you mentioned, Vitaliy Sergeyevich, in northern Europe -- are part of the whole. The best thing would be the establishment of such a zone covering the whole world. However, one must not insist on the best method to the detriment of good ones and therefore, the Soviet Union supports establishing zones in various regions. For example, the Soviet Union has supported Finland's proposal for such a zone in northern Europe. This is also stated in the Political Declaration adopted in January at the Prague conference of member states of the Warsaw Pact.

Furthermore, the Soviet Union is willing to examine the question of measures applicable to its own territory adjacent to such a zone. It is often asked what these measures might be. We should not put the cart before the horse. There is the willingness in principle, on the part of the Soviet Union to meet the other side halfway. If you want to be more specific, then let us come to an agreement on the zones. The agreement could be either multilateral or bilateral. We also support the Swedish proposal for a nuclear-free corridor in Central Europe -- a buffer zone free from battlefield nuclear weapons.

We, are once again, going to the talks on limitation of nuclear armaments in Europe, which begin next week. As you know, the talks are now deadlocked. The head of the American delegation, Paul Nitze, said on 12 May: There is a chance of reaching an agreement before the deployment of American missiles begins. He didn't say where he had discovered this chance, because the American position still remains a position of blocking the talks. Then General Bernard Rogers, the supreme commander of joint NATO forces in Europe, said something else quite different from what Paul Nitze said. Rogers said: The Soviet Union will not hold serious talks in Geneva until we have deployed our missiles, so as to conduct the talks from a position of strength. So there is a discordance between the two Americans, Nitze and Rogers. Who are we to believe? I think we should believe Rogers. If they -- the Americans -- want to negotiate from positions of strength, then naturally nothing will come of it. It will then not be talks, but diktat -- and the Soviet Union will not agree to a diktat. So that is the rather pessimistic situation in which the next round of the Geneva talks is beginning.

[Sobolev] The Soviet Union's good will when it comes to curbing the nuclear race in Europe is obvious, if not to all Europeans, at least to the majority. And so Washington's determination to deploy its new missiles in West Europe, come what may, is encountering increasing opposition as the deployment date set by NATO approaches.

Europe on U.S. Deployment

The West German newspaper DIE WELT writes that Eppler, a member of the FRG Social Democratic Party Executive, no longer doubts that the federal party congress in November will take a decision against the deployment of new American medium-range missiles.

And here's the opinion of the Danish Social Democrats: The NATO bloc has so great a quantity of weapons with which to counter the Soviet SS-20 missiles -- as they call them -- that the deployment of 572 new American missiles is undesirable. The Social Democrats deem it necessary to take into account at the Geneva talks the British and French nuclear forces. I say nothing of the opinion of the Danish Communists, whose congress opened this week.

And now, let's turn to the Netherlands. Prime Minister Lubbers has said he does not expect that his government will make a final decision this year on the deployment of 48 American cruise missiles on the country's territory. He feels there will not be sufficient clarity, by the end of the year, regarding the outcome of the talks in Geneva, on whose results the Netherlands Government's position in this matter depends.

In Belgium, judging by public opinion polls, two-thirds of the populace oppose the installation of 48 cruise missiles in their country. Approximately 250 Belgian population centers have been declared nuclear-free zones. The epicenter -- to adhere to that vocabulary -- of the nuclear movement is Florennes, a town next to which new missiles are to be installed. A committee has been set up there to fight to save the region. In a referendum 76 percent of the townspeople -- that is, three-fourths of them -- said they oppose the American missiles.

[Gerasimov] Well, you know, this is a picture that could go on forever. Take, for instance, Norway, which I recently visited. There they have a very strong public movement called "No to Nuclear Weapons." Its members are Norwegians of various political convictions. They have collected 540,000 signatures on a petition by the movement to the Storting and government. It contains three demands: ban the deployment of nuclear weapons in Norway, whether in peacetime or in time of war; make northern Europe a nuclear-free zone -- we've already talked about that -- and reduce nuclear armaments in both West and East.

It should be said in general that the Social Democratic Parties of the Scandinavian countries take the line that while the Geneva talks continue there must be no deployment.

[Volskiy] Comrade Andropov spoke in his replies of the Soviet Union's support for nuclear-free zones in Europe. Well, it is significant that his replies have evoked a wide response, not only in Europe, but beyond, far beyond. For example, the Indian paper HINDUSTAN TIMES writes that Washington will not find it easy to ward off this powerful Soviet peace initiative, which is all the stronger for being dictated by the voice of reason. Indeed, the very spirit of reason and common sense with which the Soviet peace initiative is imbued, this attitude of mind, in itself, makes difficulties for Washington's nuclear preparations, which -- let me remark -- are assuming the character of geographic escalation. That is a new term that they have now introduced, meaning that they are being spread to one new region after another. Already, Asia and the Far East are becoming, as it were, a second theater of such preparations. THE WASHINGTON POST has reported, for example, that the Pentagon even intends to site neutron weapons in South Korea. The paper argues that the West Europeans have rejected this barbaric weapon and recoiled from it, but that the Seoul regime won't dare to say no to the United States. Well, we will not try to predict the future; but it is clear that such a turn of events would be all the more dangerous because it could create a precedent.

The Reagan administration is already set on an official course toward armed intervention reinforced by its nuclear strategy, armed intervention in all sorts of different regions. In a recent speech calling for such intervention in Central America President Reagan also said that for the United States much is at stake both in the Near East, in the Persian Gulf, on the borders of the NATO zone, and also in Asia. In other words, he enumerated, in effect, pretty well the whole world. A doctrine is being submitted which envisages for the United States some sort of right to global violence. It is not for nothing that in Lebanon, particularly, under the flag of the international force, the U.S. Rapid Deployment Forces are also becoming entrenched.

[Sobolev] Now I think we must talk in detail about the situation in the Near East.

U.S.-Israeli Interests

[Gerasimov] U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz has just spent 2 whole weeks there. This, by the way, was his first visit to the region as secretary of state, and it would be interesting to know what he managed to do there in those 2 weeks. Dmitriy Antonovich?

[Volskiy] Well, he would nominally seem to have succeeded in achieving the formulation of a draft Lebanese-Israeli agreement. He was evidently not destined to bring about the implementation of this plan, however; at any rate, he is reported to be planning a return to the Near East. Events in the diplomatic sphere are thus now centered on the so-called Shultz option. Characteristically, however, this option of the U.S. secretary of state has not only a diplomatic side, so to speak, but also a military aspect, which demonstrates the real worth of the words about peace featured in the title of this document which Shultz has drafted. The military aspect consists in the fact that at the very same time as Shultz was making his trip Israel was intensifying its threats to inflict a strike on Syria. This does not appear to be directly linked with his trip. If we cast a glance at the essence of the matter and look into the internal logic of the way things are developing, so to speak, then we see that the political and military levels of the U.S. Administration's activity in the Near East are closely interrelated. They constantly intersect and supplement one another. The recently issued TASS statement exposes this very laconically: They speak about peace while preparing for another war. This is pointed out by the TASS statement.

[Gerasimov] The United States is of course continuing to champion Israel. And here an interesting fact comes to mind: While Shultz was off on his trip there, committees of the House of Representatives and Senate of the U.S. Congress approved an increase in military aid to Israel which was $300 million more than the Reagan administration requested for 1984. That is, they are giving even more money than the administration itself requested.

[Volskiy] This was done at the very moment when Israel is toughening up its policy and issuing new threats directed not only at Syria but also at Jordan and a number of other states.

[Gerasimov] Yes, open incitement to the aggressor.

[Sobolev] In this connection we should cite the statement made by the Israeli chief of general staff, who declared that he foresees the possibility of military confrontation with Syria on all fronts.

[Volskiy] This is of course a self-revelatory statement, bearing witness to the fact that the Israeli command has no intention of restricting its military operations only to the Lebanese Al-Biqa' Valley area, where the Israelis have established a real mailed fist aimed against the Syrian contingents of the inter-Arab forces.

These inter-Arab forces, incidentally, of which the Syrians form part, were invited by the Lebanese Government as long as a few years ago and were deployed by decision of the Arab League, and they cannot of course be in any way compared to the Israeli occupation forces which illegally invaded that country. An attack by the Israelis against the inter-Arab forces, were it to take place -- this would not be difficult, technically, since the distance between the positions of the Israelis and the Syrians in the Al-Biqa' Valley is only about 90 meters, this is, within hand-to-hand combat distance -- would of course be a serious step toward escalating the Near East conflict.

The Israeli military preparations on the Golan Heights, however, are maybe even more dangerous. Israel tore these away from Syria back in 1967. The distance from there to Damascus, you see, is even less than from the Al-Biqa' Valley. This is thus the second possible front to which the Israeli chief of general staff referred, as you mentioned, Vitaliy Sergeyevich. A third front could also be established. For instance, the Israelis are reported to have made simulated air raids on Damascus suburbs in the Negev Desert. They constructed models of some buildings there reminiscent of buildings in Damascus suburbs and bombed them, thus demonstrating their readiness to carry out air strikes agianst the Syrian capital. It should be said, however, that we no longer hear that self-confidence, bravdo and bragging even in statements made by Israeli generals, I think, were they utter threats to Syria. They can only understand that the Syrians were full of determination to stand up for themselves and also have the potential to do so.

[Sobolev] These threats against Syria are evidently aimed at compelling it to agree to the conditions of the so-called Lebanon statement which U.S. Secretary of State Shultz brought to the Near East. Is that not so, Dmitriy Antonovich?

[Volskiy] Yes, and the Americans are also exerting pressure in the same direction as the Begin government, only using different means -- diplomatic rather than military. For instance, attempts are being made to exert pressure on the Syrians through Saudi Arabia, given its large financial capacities. These maneuvers however, all come up against a serious hindrance. Various Arab circles -- not only the progressive Arab circles but also a considerable section of the conservatives in the Arab world, the traditionalists -- have perceived in the agreement that Shultz wants to impose on Lebanon a menace to the entire Arab world, to the entire Arab nation, as they say. The Americans and Israelis themselves make no secret of the fact that this agreement, as someone among them recently said, is tailored on the model of the Camp David agreement with As-Sadat. We recall that Camp David withdrew Egypt from the all-Arab front and permitted the United States to establish a military stronghold in the Sinai where a year ago those same Rapid Deployment Forces were deployed. Under the same flag, the multinational forces are now in Lebanon. Finally, Camp David united Begin's and Sharon's hands for the invasion of Lebanon. Now they want to do the same thing with Lebanon as they did with Egypt.

Furthermore, this agreement has not aroused unanimous approval and support even in Israel. The Communist Party, has, of course, issued a decisive condemnation of this plan. Not only the communists, but also a number of other circles greeted it guardedly. For instance, I can cite a report by the U.S. ABC television company. I quote: The Begin government is coming up against increasing pressure within the country, a television correspondent reported from Israel the other day. The call to bring the troops home from Lebanon is becoming a powerful political weapon for the leaders of the opposition Labor Party, the correspondent continues, which is criticizing the Shultz agreement.

[Sobolev] They are actually directing the criticism from the opposite aspect: They feel Israel gained too little for the losses it sustained in the war.

[Volskiy] They also criticize it for opportunistic reasons. This is just a maneuver on the part of the Labor Party, of course, for one should not build illusions about its policy. It is also essentially a wholly expansionist party, as demonstrated by the entire course if conducted when in power in Israel.

Nevertheless, I should like to cite more of the opinion of this correspondent in his report. Nevertheless, all these contradictions brought about by the working out of the Shultz agreement -- as this correspondent writes -- show that a political crisis is beginning to boil inside Israel as well. It is difficult to conceal that a draft agreement -- which from the outside should allegedly lead to peace, as the title itself says; as all the American, Israeli, and many organs of the Western press point out -- actually bears the seeds of new wars and threatens to bring about a new explosion in the Middle East.

In any event. there are now signs that American diplomacy is suffering a defeat in this matter, a defeat that they are presently trying to disguise. How? The first factor is the firm position of Syria, which sees the agreement as a threat not only to its own interests but also to the interests of the entire Arab world, and has rejected it decisively. The second factor is that although there are people in Lebanon who possibly support this agreement, the majority of the population of the country and, I think, even a considerable position of the governing circles, are opposed to this agreement, which is being imposed upon Lebanon by Israel and the United States. In the first place, it places the southern part of the country under the virtual military control of the Israeli's. Secondly, it deprives the Lebanese Government of the opportunity to decide what weapons it can equip its own Lebanese Army with, and which weapons it may not. In accordance with the plan, Israel allegedly has the right to interfere. Finally, it is reported that there are allegedly secret clauses in the plan that have not yet been divulged. However, to judge by newspaper reports, these clauses envisage measures directed against the Palestinians in Lebanon -- for there are still about 500,000 Palestinians left in Lebanon -- and against the national patriotic forces of Lebanon which account for a considerable part of the Muslim population, which comprises the majority of Lebanese inhabitants. So this agreement is also unacceptable from the point of view of the interests of the overwhelming majority of the Lebanese people.

U.S. 'Elastic Conscience' in C.A.

[Sobolev] And correspondents are reporting from America that Washington's initial optimism has been replaced by gloomy pessimism, and apparently not without reason.

But now, comrades, I would like to turn to the Security Council session, which this week discussed at the demand of Nicaragua the U.S. aggression and undeclared war against that country. There was an extremely curious exchange of arguments between Miguel D'Escoto, Nicaraguan foreign minister, and Kirkpatrick, the U.S. representative at the United Nations. Kirkpatrick said that the United States has not invaded Nicaragua at all, whereas Miguel D'Escoto said that just because the troops are not U.S. regulars does not make it any less a war waged by the Reagan administration. The same thing has happened in the Dominican Republic, in Guatemala; and when mercenaries were sent to the Bay of Pigs. Honduras, as its Washington patron, also denies what is evident to all: the fact that the Somozists are operating from its territory.

Incidentally, so far as the U.S. President is concerned, he apparently no longer believes it necessary to conceal his partiality for the Somozists and declares openly, for all to hear, that they are freedom fighters. And those close to the President are as frank as frank can be, saying that Reagan does not want to go down in history as the President who lost Central America.

This, comrades, is very reminiscent of Churchill's boastful words to the effect that he had no intention of presiding over the liquidation of the British Empire. Central America, however, is not part of the American empire and is not the property of the United States.

[Gerasimov] THE WASHINGTON POST writes about the Reagan doctrine, according to which Reagan justifies the encroachments on the sovereignty of other states and justifies the attempts to overthrow governments which come to power by means of revolution. There have, however, been very many such governments in history, and the first American Administration of President George Washington also came to power by means of revolution. In actual fact this Reagan doctrine is a return to the old ideas of a world gendarme, and THE WASHINGTON POST writes that to advance such criterion is to turn logic into absurdity.

[Sobolev] It must be said that many American leaders are afraid that this sort of policy of Reagan's will lead precisely to the same thing that happened at the time to Churchill. And these leaders are far from being of a liberal persuasion. The House of Representatives' Committee on Intelligence, for example -- to which I doubt, Gennadiy Ivanovich, that "doves" are appointed -- decided to prohibit the White House from spending dollars on the Somozists. Former CIA Director Turner wrote in the press opposing the secret operations in Nicaragua; and he carried out so many secret subversive actions himself that he ought to know what they are about. Of course, Turner would like to stifle the Sandinist government in Nicaragua. but he is afraid that the present aggression might turn against the United States. To date this idea has taken hold only with opposition leaders in America.

Another committee on intelligence, the Senate committee, has decided that money and weapons should be given to the Somozists, and a new subunit of the U.S. Secret Service has been brought into the anti-Nicaraguan operations. This subunit was set up 3 years ago to rescue by force from Tehran the U.S. diplomats held hostage. Although the operation, as we know, was a complete failure, it turns out that the subunit was not disbanded, and that it now operates in parallel with the CIA. Well, in order to prevent anything from hindering this subversive business, the U.S. diplomats at the United Nations try to refute an evident truth and keep repeating their story that there is no invasion at all; and since there is no invasion, there is no point in holding the talks proposed by Nicaragua. But the trouble for U.S. diplomacy with its -- to put it mildly -- elastic conscience is that talks, including bilateral talks, are considered necessary by other Latin American countries, too, to which Washington swears eternal friendship and whose opinion it is compelled to take into account. These are Mexico, Venezuela, Colombia and Panama, and they are not alone. And these four countries not only express their opinions but act, too.

[Volskiy] This opposition, Vitaliy Sergeyevich, to the Reagan administration's policy in Central America is part of the overall process of rebuff that the bellicose policy of the present U.S. leadership is encountering both inside the country and in other states on all continents.

[Sobolev] Yes, the Security Council, for example, has already examined the situation in Central America, also at Nicaragua's request. More than 50 representatives of various countries spoke, and with an overwhelming, absolute majority, did not accept the U.S. position or policy in the region.

Events, Elections in Europe

However, now I would like to return once more to Europe. There recently has been a noticeable upsurge in the tone, so to speak, of political life. In Britain and Italy, parliamentary elections -- early elections in both cases -- have been set for June.

In Italy, it is the consequence of the latest political crisis: There have been more than 40 changes of government there since the war, and not one of them has proved to have sufficient viability. To a certain degree, this is because the Communist Party, the second most important political force in the country -- which, incidentally, has great experience of governing at the local authority level -- is kept out of governing at the national level. This, by the way, is not without interference by the United States. It has been established that the CIA spent tens of millions of dollars to prevent the Communists from taking part in the Italian Government. It is now becoming more and more clear that former Prime Minister Aldo Moro, the Christian Democrat leader, was killed by terrorists because he was leaning toward cooperation with the Communist Party.

[Gerasimov] As far as the elections in Britain are concerned they have been set for 9 June, 11 months early -- the Conservatives have hastened to hold them because they consider this to be an advantageous moment. It is out of tactical considerations; they are simply afraid they will lose 11 months later. The unemployment situation now appears to have stabilized somewhat and other problems have somehow decreased slightly with the summer. So the Conservatives are hoping that if they hold early elections, they will remain in power. However, this is a risk -- we shall see -- because both the Labor Party and the Social Democrats have entered the election campaign very actively. Incidentally, one of the campaign issues is now the problem of ending or continuing the nuclear arms race for Britain, so some very interesting news is in store for us from that country.

[Sobolev] I would like to note that there is political agitation in Western Europe -- not just in Britain and Italy, but also in other countries. It is evident from the example of those countries that this agitation is largely a result of economic difficulties. The annual session of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, which is composed of the 24 leading capitalist countries, ended last week in Paris. It took place with differences of opinion. For example, toward the end of the session, the U.S. delegation gave a dinner for the participants, but the French did not show their faces. While the government of the Western countries do not always agree with one another, they do act in concord against the rights and interests of working people.

THE WASHINGTON POST has this to say: For more than 2 years now, Reagan has been waging a war against the poor. The attacks are continuing, and the number of casualties is growing. The administration is drawing up plans for further reduction: by 9 percent in the food stamps program; allocations for food aid for children are to be cut by another 8 percent; grants for heating to low-income families are to be reduced by 30 percent; the summer vacation youth employment scheme is to be cut by 12 percent and so on. This is while the administration does not tire of speaking of the start of a revival in the economy and renewed production growth.

In Europe, there is less optimism on this, even in government circles. Forecasts for 1984 promise an increase in unemployment to 35 million and more. Such are the sad reports. The chief European problem is still the new U.S. missiles -- thus parliamentary elections; political campaigns in general; and the struggle against social injustice, for jobs, and for maintaining the living standards. All of this is merged together with the struggle to end the arms race. The broad and effective movement for peace and security of peoples was given a high assessment by Comrade Andropov. This movement, he said, cannot but be taken into account by statesmen and governments if they value the opinion of their peoples. In this respect, the peace movement is undoubtedly having an effect on the arms limitation talks. At this point, comrades, we end our program. Thank you for listening, and all the best.

GORBACHEV RECEIVES CANADIAN ENVOY, LEAVES FOR VISIT

Meets With Ambassador

PM131220 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 May 83 First Edition p 4

[Unattributed report: "Ambassador Received"]

[Text] On 11 May M.S. Gorbachev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, received G.A. Pearson, Canadian ambassador to the USSR, at his request.

The conversation that took place touched on questions of mutual interest.

Gorbachev To Lead Delegation

LD142205 Montreal International Service in English 2130 GMT 14 May 83

[Text] A top Soviet official will lead a six-member delegation on a 1-week visit to Canada, starting on Monday. He is Mikhail Gorbachev, a member of the Politburo, the highest Soviet decision-making body.

Canadian officials say the Soviet delegation will discuss agriculture, bilateral relations and international affairs, including the nuclear arms race and the Soviet military presence in Afghanistan.

Delegation Departs

LD161051 Moscow TASS in English 1045 GMT 16 May 83

[Text] Moscow May 16 TASS -- A USSR Supreme Soviet delegation, led by Mikhail Gorbachev, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committtee, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the Commission for Legislative Proposals of the Soviet of the Union of the USSR Supreme Soviet, left Moscow for Canada today for an official visit at the invitation of that country's parliament.

SOVIET-U.S. CONSULTATIVE COMMISSION SESSION ENDS

LD132324 Moscow TASS in English 2105 GMT 13 May 83

[Text] Geneva May 13 TASS - A session of the Soviet-American Permanent Consultative Commission ended here today. The commission was formed to promote realisation of the aims and provisions of the treaty on limitation of anti-ballistic missile systems and the interim agreement on some measures in the sphere of limitation of strategic offensive armaments, concluded between the USSR and the United States on May 26, 1972, and also the agreement on measures to lessen the danger of a nuclear war which was concluded between the two countries on September 30, 1971.

HU YAOBANG: WISH FOR NORMAL RELATIONS WITH USSR

LD151722 Moscow TASS in English 1704 GMT 15 May 83

[Text] Belgrade May 15 TASS -- General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China Hu Yaobang has ended his official visit to Yugoslavia. In the course of the visit he held negotiations with party leaders and statemen of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. Hu Yaobang made trips to Croatia and Slovenia.

At a press conference in Belgrade, Hu Yaobang specifically touched upon the Middle East situation. China stands for Israel's withdrawal of its troops from Lebanon and subsequent withdrawal of all foreign troops from that country, he said. We believe that the Palestine Liberation Organization is the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, and back the Palestinian people's right to national self-determination, he said.

Answering one of the questions, the general secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China said: "China sincerely wishes normalisation of relations with the USSR. This meets the fundamental interests of the two countries and also the interests of peace and stability in the whole world." He asserted, however, that for that "it is necessary to remove the obstacles which imperil China's sovereignty and security". He said that there are not many such obstacles but they are serious.

PRC CITIZEN SENTENCED FOR SPYING FOR U.S.

LD160845 Moscow TASS in English 0716 GMT 16 May 83

[Text] Beijing May 16 TASS -- Beijing's People's Court has sentenced a certain Luo Chengxun to ten years in jail on charges of spying for the United States, XINHUA NEWS AGENCY reports.

Luo Chengxun, the report says, became an agent of the American intelligence many years ago and supplied the U.S. espionage agency with important secret information of a political and military nature. The convicted person fully admitted the charges levelled against him, the agency points out.

BRIEFS

DENG LIQUN ARTICLE -- A new journal called SELF-EDUCATION has come off the press in China. In this connection a member of the Secretariat of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party, Deng Liqun, wrote an article for the (?GONGREN RIBAO) about the great importance of self-education in China, because a great number of young people do not have the opportunity to attend school. At the same time Deng Liqun admitted that there is a great number of illiterates in China. At present only 10 percent of the adult population of China have a secondary school education; 23 percent of the population is illiterate. Stressing the great importance of self-education in China, Deng Liqun writes that socialism cannot be built in a country flooded with illiteracy. [Text] [Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in English to Asia 1300 GMT 14 May 83 LD]

ARKHIPOV OFFICIAL VISIT TO INDIA CONTINUES

Joint Cooperation Praised

LD132112 Moscow TASS in English 1809 GMT 13 May 83

[Text] Moscow May 13 TASS -- TASS Commentator Sergey Bulantsev writes:

The bilateral agreement on cooperation in the construction of the second stage of the metullurgical complex in Visakhapatnam has become a new, important milestone in the development of Soviet-Indian economic links. The agreement was signed in New Delhi in the course of the current visit to friendly India of a Soviet delegation led by First Deputy Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers Ivan Arkhipov. The agreement reaffirms the high level of maturity of economic links between the two countries [and] their profound interest in further expansion of cooperation.

The milestones of this cooperation can be traced by India's industrial map. Who in Asia, and far outside it, does not know know the word "Bhilai"? Comparatively recently, as middle-aged people remember, that was just a small settlement in the state of Madhya Pradesh, and now it is the symbol of new India. Orders for products of the Bhilai plant, the firstling of Soviet-Indian economic cooperation, now come from Japan, Turkey, New Zealand, Malaysia, and many other countries.

Bhilai is one of the cities which are associated in national conscience as a symbol of a new era in India -- these words beiong to the great son of the Indian people Jawaharlal Nehru. Such remarkable symbols are growing in numbers and the Visakhapatnam is one of them. More than 70 big industrial and agricultural projects sprang up on Indian soil owing to the joint selfless labour of Indians and Russians. India is now among the countries which actively participate in space exploration, largely owing to these efforts. And in a not remote past India was an agrarian country which wholly depended on imports of foreign industrial commodities.

Soviet-Indian economic partnership is an example of new, fair economic relations the establishment of which is sought by the developing states. It is indicative that in the struggle for the long overdue restructuring of international economic relations on the principles of equality, just as on other cardinal problems of the present, the USSR and India hold common positions.

This reflects the community of aims and interests of the two most influential forces of the present -- the socialist community and the Nonaligned Movement.

In India they say: Indian-Soviet friendship is as strong as the Bhilai steel, but many-sided Soviet-Indian cooperation serves not only economic interests of the two countries, it promotes spiritual enrichment of two great peoples -- creators. In this perhaps lies the inexhaustible vivifying strength of our friendship.

Arkhipov on Oil Refineries

LD141044 Moscow TASS in English 0855 GMT 14 May 83

[Text] Mathura (North India) May 14 TASS -- PTI News Agency reports:

Mr Ivan Arkhipov, first deputy prime minister of the USSR, said today that the commissioning of the Mathura oil refinery was an important step in meeting India's requirements in petroleum products and in raw materials for the chemical industry for the production of fertilizers in the north-western and central regions of the country.

Conveying to the government and people of India warm felicitations and good wishes from the Soviet leaders and personally from Mr Yuriy Andropov on the occasion, Mr Arkhipov said the designing, construction, and commissioning of the plant had vividly demonstrated the high skill and experience which Indian specialists had gained during the development of the oil-refining industry.

Many of the specialists who built the plant at Mathura, Mr Arkhipov said, had been engaged earlier in the construction and operation of the oil refineries at Barauni (Bihar) and Koyali (Gujarat) as well as the expansion of their capacities. A few of them had even worked at the "pioneering plant" of Soviet-Indian cooperation -- the Bhilai steel plant, he added.

"We feel deeply gratified," Mr Arkhipov said, that Soviet specialists who worked shoulder to shoulder with their Indian colleagues participated in the designing, construction, and commissioning of the Mathura plant, and also that the "tradition of sincere friendship" had become a characteristic feature of this Soviet-Indian production as well.

"Our friendship is one of the most precious assets of the two great peoples; it is the product of their mind and heart," he stressed.

India and the USSR signed a new protocol on July 20, 1973, for the construction of the Mathura refinery with a capacity of six million tonnes of oil a year, one of the biggest refineries not only in India but also in South and Southeast Asia. Prime Minister Mrs Indira Gandhi laid the foundation stone of the refinery on October 2 that year.

The refinery went into trial commercial production last year, and today that plant has reached its design capacity of six million tonnes of oil a year.

Unlike the earlier built refineries, the Mathura factory has catalytic and thermal oil-cracking plants, oil-products refining plants. These ensure a considerably higher output of middle distillates like diesel which are in high demand in India.

When it attains full capacity, the Mathura refinery will annually produce over two million tonnes of high-grade diesel fuel; 800,000 tonnes of boiler oil; 650,000 tonnes of kerosene; 350,000 tonnes of petrol; 180,000 tonnes of liquefied gas; and numerous other oil products.

The refinery is designed to process oil imported from the Middle East countries and oil from the Bombay High.

Indian organizations have built a 1219 km long oil pipeline from the port of Salaya in the Gulf of Kutch in the Arabian Sea to Mathura via Viramgam, and a 513-km-long pipeli e for carrying oil products from Mathura to Jullundur in Punjab via Delhi.

The USSR provided 32,000 tonnes of equipment and rendered assistance for the designing, construction, and commissioning, and also to train specialists for the refinery.

In the sixties, the USSR helped India build oil refineries in Barauni and Koyali with a capacity of three million tonnes of oil a year each, which formed the basis of the oil-refining industry in the state sector.

Today, all the three enterprises -- Barauni, Koyali, and Mathura -- together account for more than 40 percent of the country's aggregate oil-refining potential.

Indian Amity Group Addressed

LD141337 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 14 May 83

[Text] A mass Indian public organization, the Friends of the Soviet Union Society, held a formal reception in honor of Comrade Arkhipov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, who is on an official visit to India. Welcoming the Soviet guest, Nurul Hasan, chairman of the society, a well-known scientist and public figure, said that the Indian people entertain sentiments of sincere and deep-seated friendship toward the Soviet Union. The great Soviet Union was the first to come to India's aid in establishing its economy and has always been allied with India in difficult times. An enormous impression is made on all of us, noted Nurul Hasan, by the tireless struggle of the Soviet Union and Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, for peace and the relaxation of international tension against the threat of nuclear war. We join the Soviet Union in this struggle.

In his reply, Comrade Arkhipov warmly thanked the activists of the Friends of the Soviet Union Society for their great efforts in stregthening Indian-Soviet friendship. He wished the activists much success in their noble cause, which serves the deepening of mutual understanding and strengthening of friendship between Indian and Soviet peoples.

Arkhipov, Rao Predeparture Statements

LD160855 Moscow TASS in English 0723 GMT 16 May 83

[Text] New Delhi May 16 TASS -- "We are satisfied with the results of the visit," Ivan Arkhipov, first deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, told journalists at the airport before departure. We had talks on a wide range of questions connected with bilateral relations and on international problems. Together with the Indian side we had full identity of views, first of all, on matters of peace, detente and others.

Much attention was devoted to the development of trade and economic relations between our countries. We analyzed their state as of today and looked into prospects. We have found additional interesting problems and projects which will enable us to tangibly confirm our common desire for further development of trade and economic cooperation. The atmosphere in which the talks and the meetings with President Zail Singh of India and Prime Minister Indira Gandhi were held was cordial and friendly, as befits a meeting of good friends, he said.

Answering Indian journalists' questions on what reaction the Soviet Union expects from the United States to its latest peace proposals, Ivan Arkhipov said: Of course a person cannot live without hope. But, frankly speaking, there are so far no signs of the realization of this hope. Although statements on the part of the USA are made -- in public and at meetings with representatives of the USSR -- those statements so far are not confirmed by concrete positive actions of the U.S. side. But we are optimists. We hope that the world public, and first of all that in Western countries, will say its weighty word, the word of influence on the leadership of those countries, in order to find a reply to proposals which the Soviet Union makes with a view to improving the international situation.

P.V. Narasimha Rao, Indian minister of external affairs, fully agreed with Ivan Arkhipov's appraisal of the results of the Indian-Soviet talks. The visit was very useful and we are extremely pleased with its results. Our talks were very positive and very useful. I agree with Ivan Arkhipov's opinion that in the present complex international situation one should not lose hope that the cause of peace will triumph, P.V. Narasimha Rao emphasized.

Official Visit Concludes

LD160518 Moscow TASS in English 0513 GMT 16 May 83

[Text] New Delhi May 16 TASS -- The official friendly visit to India by Ivan Arkhipov, first deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, is over. At Palam airport the Soviet guest was seen off by P.V. Narasimha Rao, Indian minister of external affairs, and by other officials.

During the visit Ivan Arkhipov had meetings with President Zail Singh of India and Prime Minister Indira Gandhi. Ivan Arkhipov and P.V. Narasimha Rao -- co-chairmen of the Inter-Governmental Soviet-Indian Commission for Economic, Scientific, Technical and Trade Cooperation, held talks. The sides discussed current matters of cooperation between the two countries and exchanged views on its prospects. An agreement on cooperation of the USSR in the construction of the second section of the metallurgical mill in Visakhapatnam (Andhra Pradesh) was signed. The Soviet guest attended the inauguration ceremony at the oil-processing plant in Mathura (Uttar Pradesh) which has been built with the Soviet Union's assistance. Ivan Arkhipov also had meetings with members of the Indian public. The meetings developed into a vivid manifestation of the unbreakable Soviet-Indian friendship.

MOSCOW CONDEMNS U.S. SUPPORT FOR AFGHAN REBELS

LD132042 Moscow World Service in English 1600 GMT 13 May 83

[Text] United Nations Secretary General Perez de Cuellar has been assured by United States Ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick that the Reagan administration has always supported efforts to bring about a political settlement around Afghanistan. But actions speak louder than words. Our commentary has been prepared by Viktor Olin.

Jeane Kirkpatrick is an advocate of what is known as a double standard approach to world affairs, broadly practised by the United States she represents. In accordance with this principle the United States gives diplomatic, military, and financial backing to dictatorial regimes and terrorist groups if they adhere to defending what America calls its vital interests. Terrorists and killers are labelled freedom and democracy champions and dedicated fighters for human rights. Jeane Kirkpatrick's mission has been talking up diplomatic support for these men by making statements and declarations in the United Nations to mislead it. She did much to mislead the United Nations when it came to the United States' role in the events in and around Afghanistan.

Ambassador Kirkpatrick claimed that her government is fully in favor of resolving the problem politically but the United States has been doing the contrary. Last fall President Reagan himself ordered augmenting arms consignment to terrorist bands sent to Afghanistan to destabilize the situation, thereby hindering a political solution there. On presidential instructions the Central Intelligence Agency has begun to supply counterrevolutionaries with heavy weaponry. The hardware reaches Afghanistan through its border with Pakistan. At the same time the Reagan administration took steps to prevent normalization of relations between Pakistan and Afghanistan. On definite conditions Pakistan received more than $3 billion worth of aid.

But officials in Washington feel this is insufficient. They are insisting on the aid to counterrevolutionary bands to be inflated. They hope to do to Afghanistan what the United States is already doing toward Nicaragua, trying to overthrow the democratic system by training and equipping with arms those elements that were driven out by Nicaragua's revolutionary movement. So we can see that the United States Administration is no way helping bring about a political settlement around Afghanistan, a settlement [word indistinct] an end be written to outside interference.

USSR-SFRY SIGN PROGRAM OF CULTURAL COOPERATION

Maltsev on Cultural Relations

LD132341 Moscow in Serbo-Croatian to Yugoslavia 1900 GMT 13 May 83

[Excerpt] Esteemed listeners, as we have already reported, Viktor Maltsev, member of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR First Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs, and Milojko Drulovic, member of the PCY Central Committee and SFRY ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary in the Soviet Union, signed in Moscow today a program of cultural cooperation between the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia for the 1983-85 period.

In an interview with our correspondent Comrade Maltsev said:

[Begin recording in Russian with superimposed Serbo-Croatian translation] The new program continues and develops earlier agreements on Soviet-Yugoslav cultural cooperation, the USSR first deputy minister of foreign affairs says. This program encompasses all aspects of cultural and scientific ties between our two countries and envisages many kinds of contacts between cultural workers, artists and scientists. I would like to draw attention to the fact that lovely holidays, such as mutual days of culture of our peoples and their republics, will continue to be organized, Viktor Maltsev stressed. Many artists' collectives and soloists will perform in the Soviet Union and in Yugoslavia. Active cultural cooperation is an organic component part of all-round Soviet-Yugoslav relations, Viktor Maltsev says. These ties contribute to the enriching of the culture of our peoples and contribute to the consolidation of the traditional friendship of the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia. We believe that cultural ties between the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia are favourably developing, constantly expanding and deepening the USSR first deputy minister of foreign affairs concluded. [end recording]

Agreement Signed in Moscow

LD132331 Moscow in Serbo-Croatian to Yugoslavia 1900 GMT 13 May 83

[Text] A program of cultural cooperation between the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia for the 1983-85 period was signed in Moscow today. This document, which envisages the expansion of comprehensive Soviet-Yugoslav relations in the sphere of culture, arts, science and popular education, was signed by Viktor Maltsev, member of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR First Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs, and by Milojko Drulovic, member of the LCY Central Committee and SFRY ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary in the Soviet Union. Speaking in an interview with our correspondent, Comrades Maltsev and Drulovic made a highly appreciative assessment of the new plan of Soviet-Yugoslav cultural ties, which represent an important component part of the friendly relations and cooperation between the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia.

IZVESTIYA DERIDES SWEDISH SUB REPORT 'MYTH'

LD161019 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 May 83 Morning Edition p 3

[G. Ivanov commentary under the rubric "On Topical Subjects": "To Whose Advantage Is This?"]

[Text] Recently the Swedish press has been earnestly blowing up the myth about almost daily visits by Soviet submarines to Swedish territorial waters. This myth has been picked up by press organs in Norway and Denmark and subsequently by all organs of bourgeois propaganda in the West. The choir of disseminators of these idle fictions about Soviet submarines has been joined by some of Sweden's statesmen and politicians.

What was the pretext for this unseemly propaganda campaign against the Soviet Union? It seems that it was a report by a special commission set up in Sweden to establish whether foreign submarines are really intruding into its territorial waters and, if so, to whom they belong. The commission took quite some time to find the "truth," but even so failed to find any convincing proof. Then, wasting no further time, its members decided that there were "tracks" left by submarines and that these tracks point, they claim, directly and only to Soviet submarines. The reference to "tracks" is the main material evidence in the commission's report of incursion by Soviet submarines into Swedish territorial waters.

It is to be regretted that the Swedish Government shares the views of the commission's report. Furthermore, relying on the commission's clearly invented conclusions, the Swedish Government sent a protest to the USSR Government on 26 April in connection with the violations of Swedish territorial waters limits allegedly committed by Soviet submarines. This protest, having nothing in common with the facts, cannot be treated otherwise than as an unfriendly act toward the USSR.

The appropriate Soviet authorities have carried out a careful investigation into the position of Soviet submarines in the Baltic Sea at the time referred to by the Swedish Government in its statement. It has been precisely established that not a single one of them was closer than 30 km to Swedish territorial waters, and thus the attempts to attribute to Soviet submarines violations of Sweden's borders are clearly groundless. Equally groundless is the claim contained in the Swedish protest that Soviet submarines supposedly "engaged in surveys of Swedish maritime territory." The Swedes themselves have entered on all charts all data referring to navigation in their coastal waters, and these can be freely used by seafarers of foreign states.

The Soviet Union invariably and strictly observes the universally accepted principles of international law and respects the borders of other states. This is one of the cornerstone principles of Soviet foreign policy, and the Swedish Government cannot but be aware of this.

In connection with this the Soviet Government has, naturally, firmly rejected the protest contained in the Swedish Government's declaration as being totally groundless and has, at the same time, expressed the hope that the Swedish Government will hold a further, objective investigation of all facts of the matter and will take the necessary steps against the persons guilty of presenting falsified materials and conclusions.

The legitimate question emerges as to who benefits from this slanderous campaign about Soviet submarines which has been launched in Sweden.

There can be only one answer to it: Of course, those forces (and they are not only beyond Sweden's borders but also within the country itself) which have long engaged in undermining the process of detente, intimidated the citizens of the West with a nonexistent "Soviet military threat," and launched one provocative anti-Soviet campaign after another in their attempts to cast aspersions on the USSR's peace-loving foreign policy and undermine its good relations with Sweden.

Facts are convincing things, and the facts show that the Soviet Union invariably and sincerely strives to develop good-neighborly relations with Sweden on the basis of mutual respect and understanding. This is especially important now, under the conditions of a complex international situation, when cooperation between the two countries could play a constructive role and further the process of detente and the strengthening of peace in northern Europe. This principled line of the USSR in relations not only with Sweden but also with all other countries in northern Europe was clearly reaffirmed in Yu. V. Andropov's replies to questions put by representatives from a number of Finnish public organizations.

NORWEGIAN RADAR SYSTEM PLAN DRAWS CRITICISM

PM121517 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 12 May 83 First Edition p 3

[TASS-attributed A. Yevdokimov article: "Under U.S. and NATO Pressure"]

[Text] In Oslo the Norwegian Government has officially announced its decision to build nine new Loran-C radar systems in the country in addition to the two already in operation. As the press reports, the construction program is calculated, to last until 1987 and will cost Norwegian taxpayers 76 million krone.

This news sparked off a wave of protests. The authorities hastened to state that this was a harmless matter. The proposal to build the stations was apparently put forward by Norway's oil companies and will serve to improve conditions for navigation in oilfield areas and for coastal communications.

In reply, the newspaper DAGBLADET has written that the Loran-C stations are needed primarily to serve U.S. nuclear submarines and by no means purely civil aims. Furthermore, after commissioning they are to be handed over to the Defense Ministry's safekeeping. There have also been reports of Washington's intention to deploy such stations on the Spitsbergen Archipelago, although their use for military purposes would contravene the Paris treaty on Spitsbergen signed in 1920.

The press here has already repeated drawn the attention of the country's public to the dangerous actions by the United States and NATO in building up military preparations in northern Europe, primarily Norway, which, in the NATO strategists' opinion, is of "special strategic significance."

The increased visits to Norway by high-ranking U.S. and NATO military figures, the holding on Norwegian soil of various exercises and maneuvers, and the peacetime use of Norwegian naval bases by U.S. and British missile-carrying submarines are regarded in Norway as evidence of a permanent foreign military presence. At the same time, the United States is also striving to give this a legal basis, which is attested, in particular, by the agreement between the United States and Norway signed in January 1981 on the deployment of U.S. heavy military equipment. It is directly linked to another U.S.-Norwegian agreement governing the presence of U.S. troops on Norwegian territory and when they are to be shipped there. The agreement obliges Norway to prepare its airfields to receive U.S. aircraft capable of carrying nuclear weapons.

Washington and NATO term such activity a "package of security measures in the event of a crisis situation." But it is quite obvious that they are aimed, as many Norwegians believe, undermining the principles of Norwegian military policy in accordance with which Norway has refused to deploy foreign troops and nuclear weapons on its territory in peace-time. Furthermore, this activity harms detente in the political sphere and hinders the extension of detente to the military sphere.

Norwegian officials are claiming the opposite and are striving to neutralize the population's increasing concern by statements about the "defensive character" of these measures. However, the country's progressive public rightly believes that by its actions under U.S. pressure, the conservative government is essentially denying the sincerity of its own peaceful assurances.

27TH CONGRESS OF DANISH COMMUNIST PARTY HELD

CPSU Sends Greetings

PM131537 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 May 83 First Edition p 1

[Text] To the 27th Communist Party of Denmark [DKP] Congress:

Dear Comrades!

The CPSU Central Committee send warm fraternal greetings to the 27th DKP Congress and all Danish Communists and wishes the congress successful and fruitful work.

Your party's congress has convened at a complex and perturbing time when the forces of imperialism and reaction headed by the militarist circles of the United States and NATO are making unprecedentedly intensive military and above all nuclear preparations on a global scale and particularly in West Europe. These aggressive aspirations are accompanied by attacks against the forces of peace, democracy, and national independence and by flagrant diktat and interference in the internal affairs of other countries, and the launching of a political, ideological and economic campaign against socialism.

At the same time the world's peoples are becoming increasingly deeply aware of the need for vigorous actions in defense of peace. In West Europe the wave of antiwar movements is expanding which, irrespective of the political views of those taking part, resolutely oppose the deployment of new U.S. nuclear missiles on the European Continent.

People in the Soviet Union are well aware that the DKP together with all its country's progressive forces actively opposes the sinister plans of the United States and NATO in West Europe and advocates the transformation of northern Europe into a zone free of nuclear weapons.

It is with a feeling of solidarity that Soviet Communists treat the DKP which is tirelessly waging a struggle for the interests of the working class and the unity of the working people's actions against big capital and the tyrany of the monopolies.

Guided by the great teaching of Marx, Engels and Lenin, the DKP makes its contribution to the consolidation of the cohesion and solidarity of the world's communists in the interests of the struggle against the forces of imperialism and reaction.

The CPSU Central Committee wishes the fraternal DKP success in its activity, in the expansion and consolidation of its ties with the masses, and in the intensification of the unity of action of the working people and all progressive forces of Denmark for the triumph of the cause of peace, democracy, and socialism.

Long live the DKP!

Long live the friendship between the CPSU and the DKP and between the Soviet and Danish peoples!

Long live peace and socialism!

[Signed] The CPSU Central Committee

Soviet Delegation Attends

LD132317 Moscow TASS in English 1854 GMT 13 May 83

[Text] Copenhagen May 13 TASS -- The 27th Congress of the Communist Party of Denmark is oontinuing its work here. Yesterday's evening session was addressed by the head of the CPSU delegation, member of the CPSU Central Committee, First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Latvia A.E. Vos.

The Communist Party of Denmark, the head of the CPSU delegation noted in particular, makes a profound analysis of the present development in the world and outlines concrete roads of struggle against the arms race, against the military preparations of American imperialism and the NATO circles, for the revival and continuation of the process of detente.

Indeed, the international situation has been extremely aggravated and this requires vigorous joint actions by all forces of peace and progress so as to prevent the danger of nuclear war. As is known, the Reagan administration has openly set course at further aggravating the international situation, at fanning up military psychosis, at imparting an unprecedented pace to the arms race and achieving military superiority over the Soviet Union at all cost.

There is evidently no need to say what is Reagan's "zero option" and his "interim variant" around which a propaganda outcry is being raised so intensively, A.E. Vos noted. These proposals do not introduce anything that is constructive and new, and pursue only one aim -- to weaken the defence might of of the Soviet Union, to upset the existing parity of armed forces and armaments. It is quite understandable that the Soviet Union will never accept unilateral disarmament in face of imperialism which is constantly building up its might.

Our party, all Soviet people are doing and will do everything possible to uphold the cause of peace, to ensure the security of peoples, and to stop the arms race. We are fully resolved to press for the fulfillment of the Soviet Union's proposals, which were recently set forth by the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Yu V. Andropov, and also of the initiatives of the Warsaw Treaty member-states which indicate a real way out of the obtaining situation. In his answers to questions by representatives of a number of Finland's public organisations Yu. V. Andropov has again declared in support of the idea to create a nuclear-free zone in the north of Europe, the head of the CPSU delegation said.

An extensive discussion, first of all of questions of invigorating the anti-war movement, has started at the congress.

Vigour in the struggle for peace and against the growing menance of nuclear catastrophe is an inalienable part of the daily activity of every Communist, it was said in particular by T. Sterner, member of the board of the Committee of Cooperation for Peace and Security.

The anti-war movement in Denmark is acquiring lately new forms and constantly gaining in strength. It is being joined by ever more public, women's and youth organizations, trade unions and individual groups of people. They all are united by the common striving to preserve peace and stop the continuing arms race.

Member of the Executive Committee, Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Denmark I. Nerlund noted that the present year, 1983, was the decisive year for Europe. As different from the Soviet Union, Washington does not want to assume the commitment not to be the first to use nuclear weapons and is deliberately deadlocking all disarmament talks while continuing to accelerate its military preparations.

The fulfilment of these dangerous plans will inevitably lead to an aggravation of the international situation. Today, I. Nerlund stressed, it is possible and necessary to secure Reagan's failure in his pursuit of military superiority by means of a new spiral of the arms race.

The congress continues its work.

SOVIET STANCE ON NORTH EUROPE PEACE ZONES CITED

PM131449 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 May 83 Morning Edition p 4

[Article by M. Zubko: "For a Nuclear-Free Northern Europe"]

[Text] "For many years the Finnish peace movement has been seeking the implementation of the proposal to create a nuclear-free zone in north Europe. We believe that Yu. V. Andropov's replies to the questions put by representatives of a number of Finnish public organizations raise exceptionally important questions for discussion and for the organization of practical work in the interests of normalizing international relations. The replies are of great importance both for Finland and beyond our country -- "for Europe and the whole world" -- that is the assessment given by the Finnish peace movement of the CPSU Central Committee general secretary's statement.

These are very important proposals. They are of a wide-ranging nature: from the halting of the production of nuclear weapons to the problem of renouncing the first use of nuclear weapons. In this commentary we would like to draw attention to one aspect of these replies. The representatives of Finnish public organizations asked the Soviet leader: Do you support the creation of a nuclear-free zone in north Europe, for instance, and are you ready to provide guarantees for the security of such zones?

Yu. V. Andropov answered this question very thoroughly. Yes, the Soviet Union does support the creation of such zones, particularly in northern Europe, and views them as an important means of consolidating the peoples' security.

Let us recall that the Soviet Union is a consistent champion of the creation of such zones in various parts of the world. It is a logical expression of the Peace Program proclaimed by the 24th CPSU Congress in 1971. This program stated: "Promote the creation of nuclear-free zones in various parts of the world."

The Warsaw Pact states' Political Declaration adopted in Prague on 5 January 1983 expressed support for just such a course. "The states represented at the conference are in favor of proposals to create nuclear-free zones in northern Europe, the Balkans, and other parts of the continent.

So the Soviet Union's positive attitude toward the idea of creating nuclear-free zones is a firm and principled one. Those who would like to cast a shadow on our country and prove" that it is threatening someone are trying to distort this position. Today in some Scandinavian countries (not without the participation of pro-NATO circles) noisy campaigns are being mounted pursuing the same goal.

Lenin once said that "history is a devilishly good teacher." So history teaches us that the Soviet Union never threatens anyone, that it struggles consistently for peace, mutually advantageous cooperation, and good-neighborliness.

Yu. V. Andropov's replies to the questions put by representatives of Finnish public organizations were yet more evidence of the USSR's peace-loving course. The north European countries noted with great interest that section of his statements which says that the Soviet Union is ready to undertake not to use nuclear weapons against north European countries which become members of a nuclear-free zone. "Understandably," the replies say, "the security of these countries would be safeguarded even more reliably if the relevant guarantees were also provided by the NATO nuclear states."

The Soviet Union has expressed readiness to go even further. The replies note that "taking into account the wishes expressed in a number of Sancandinavian countries, the USSR would also be prepared to examine the question of some measures, and substantial ones at that, with respect to its own territory adjacent to this zone -- measures which would help to consolidate northern Europe's nuclear-free status."

The USSR's new proposals were treated with tremendous attention not only in the Nordic countries but also in other West European states. The British newspaper THE DAILY TELEGRAPH, stressing that the Soviet Union supported the proposal to create nuclear-free zones, states, for instance, that this stance on the Soviet leadership's part accords with the north European peoples' aspirations. It is impossible to fail to agree with this statement, is it?

FRG OFFICIAL ON 4-DAY TRADE VISIT TO USSR

LD062021 Moscow TASS in English 1500 GMT 6 May 83

[Text] Moscow May 6 TASS -- The West German-Soviet business talks, completed today, have reaffirmed the sides' mutual desire to expand trade and economic ties, a TASS correspondent was told by deputy prime minister of the land of lower Saxony, Minister for the Affairs of the Federation Wilfred Hasselmann. He led a delegation of trading and industrial community of the FRG, which stayed in the Soviet Union on a four-day visit.

Wilfred Hasselmann pointed out that the Soviet side expressed interest in developing commercial relations not only with large, but also with small and medium-size firms. The promising areas for bilateral cooperation include, among other things, production and transportation of liquified gas, canned fruits and vegetables, and production of baby foods.

We, Wilfred Hasselmann said, have candidly discussed the whole set of these problems, and expressed full readiness to contribute to their resolution to the mutual advantage of both countries. Our delegation's sojourn in Moscow, he stressed, has helped to deepen the existing and establish new business contacts which will contribute to expanded bilateral trade and economic relations.

The members of the delegation were received by Deputy Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR Leonid Kostandov, Deputy Chairman of the USSR State Committee for Science and technology Dzhermen Gvishiani, and Deputy Minister of Foreign Trade of the USSR Gennadiy Zhuravlev. They held talks at the Ministries of Oil, Coal and Food Industries, and of Agriculture, as well as in Soviet foreign trade associations.

FURTHER COMMENT ON SHULTZ TRIP, LEBANON PLAN

Shultz Cited on Mission

LD121405 Moscow TASS in English 1315 GMT 12 May 83

[Text] Washington May 12 TASS -- TASS correspondent Nikolay Pakhomov reports:

President Reagan has met at the White House Secretary of State Shultz, who reported to him about the results of his visit to the Middle East.

Addressing journalists after the meeting, the head of the U.S. diplomatic community stressed that the United States would not like to fix what he called an artificial date for the withdrawal of Israeli troops from Lebanon. In the course of his "mediating mission," Shultz made attempts to bring off an agreement between Israel and Lebanon under which the troops of the Israeli aggressors as well as American troops would actually remain in Lebanese territory. Shultz admitted that draft agreement was being strongly criticized by Syria.

At the same time he stated that Washington intended to continue its policy, aimed at turning Lebanon into a staging area for Israel's new acts of aggression against neighboring Arab states and a bulwark of American military presence in the Middle East.

Shultz's visit, just like Reagan's "peace plan" which he tried to impose on the Arabs, actually has nothing to do with the search for a lasting peace or the implementation of the unanimous decision of the U.N. Security Council on the complete and unconditional withdrawal of Israeli troops from Lebanon. The efforts of the U.S. secretary of state actually boiled down to exerting massive pressure on Lebanon with the simultaneous intensification of Israeli war preparations against Syria and threats to Jordan.

Even the American press admits that Shultz's visit was accompanied by an aggravation of the situation in the Middle East. The newspaper CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR draws attention to the fact, for instance, that the mission of the U.S. secretary of state will give an impetus to a period of high tension in the region. During Shultz's stay in the Middle East Tel Aviv toughened the "preconditions" for the withdrawal of its occupation troops from Lebanon and stated their possible redeployment to fortify other Israeli positions and, according to THE WASHINGTON POST, asked for "stronger pressure" on Lebanon and Syria.

The United States encourages Tel Aviv's expansionistic policy by extending military support for the aggressor. It is symptomatic that soon after Shultz's journey the Foreign Relations Commission of the House of Representatives approved an increase in free military aid to Israel by 300 million dollars. All in all, 1.7 billion dollars for military programmes and 850 million dollars in economic aid will be received by Tel Aviv in the next fiscal year.

'Difficulties' of Mission Noted

LD122051 Moscow in Arabic to the Arab World 1530 GMT 12 May 83

[From "Window on the Arab World" Program, presented by Aleksey Blatorunskiy]

[Text] At a time when U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz has been gladly making press statements and answering questions pertaining to his mission in the Middle East, stressing the success of U.S. policy in securing the Lebanese-Israeli agreement, President Reagan was forced, in his statement made at the White House, to admit that his secretary's shuttle trip faced grave difficulties.

Naturally, this admission was not a coincidence, but was made out of necessity. Even U.S. commentators are now asking the question: Can Shultz save face for U.S. policy in the Middle East? It has been noted that the question was not one of success but of saving face.

What is the reason for this change of tone? The first reason is that the U.S. plan for the Lebanese-Israeli agreement, as is becoming clearer every day, has been rejected by Arab countries, headed by Syria and the PLO. Their non-participation in the agreement -- whatever it may be -- would render it as built on sand. The United States and some countries of the Western bloc attempt to portray the Syrian and the Palestinian position as ill intentioned and opposed to the U.S. peace efforts. However, it is hard to find behind such allegations the real reasons for the rise of difficulties in the path of Shultz' mission.

The Lebanese-Israeli agreement plan which the U.S. secretary of state wants to impose on the Arabs stems in the first instance from the interests of Israel, that is, the aggressor country. On this count it would not be an exaggeration if it were to be called the Israeli plan. However, is it not obvious that the search for a peaceful settlement on the basis of the demands of the aggressors is an exercise that is doomed to fail. [Words indistinct] that the plan proposed by Shultz is blatantly contradictory to the UN Security Council resolution, which calls, as is known, for the complete and unconditional evacuation of Israeli troops from Lebanese territories as a basis for settlement. The Arabs have a very bitter experience in signing such unilateral agreements. It suffices to mention the Camp David accords, which opened Egypt's doors to U.S. imperialism and Israeli Zionism under the pretext of establishing peace in the region. As for the Shultz plan, which is an exact copy of the so-called Reagan plan, it goes beyond the Camp David accords; it could make Lebanon a dependency of Israel and a U.S.-Israeli bridgehead for a military and political attack on other Arab countries.

Accord 'Unfair' to Lebanon

LD130907 Moscow in English to North America 2200 GMT 13 May 83

[Text] The American secretary of state, Mr Shultz, has completed his 2-week tour of the Middle East. The result of his tour is an agreement in principle between Israel and Lebanon. Commentary is by Stanislav Kondrashov of the national evening daily IZVESTIYA.

The agreement in principle, he writes, is humiliating to Lebanon. It does not provide for any kind of compensation for the Israeli aggression. On the contrary, Israel is posing as a benefactor, who has agreed in principle to withdraw its troops from Lebanon 11 months after it invaded the country. Under the agreement, the two sides pledged to respect each other's sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity. Under the same agreement, a security zone is to be set up in southern Lebanon, stretching 25 miles inside Lebanon, to be patrolled jointly by Lebanese and Israeli troops. Understandably, no such zone is to be set in Israel, because the agreement is biased in Israel's favor.

Another fact indicates what sort of sovereignty and independence for Lebanon is provided by the agreement. Major Haddad, who commands the secessionist forces defying the Lebanese agreement, is to become deputy commander of the Lebanese forces in the security zone. There are other incongruities in the agreement, which is clearly unfair as far as Lebanon is concerned. The main thing about it is that it damages the interests of other Arab nations. The Soviet news agency TASS said, commenting on the developments in Lebanon, that the country is being turned into a springboard for aggression against neighboring Arab states, and a base for U.S. military presence in the Middle East. Syria is directly threatened by Israel. Israeli tactics are to disable one Arab country after another, while continuing territorial expansion and ignoring the Palestinian issue. The agreement, reached as a result of Shultz' mission, effectively disables Lebanon, and forces that country to accept Israeli dictates.

Syria was not involved in the talks, and now attemts are made to impose on it unacceptable terms. Syria is told that it should withdraw its troops from Lebanon. Syria's troops are in Lebanon under an Arab League mandate. If Syria withdraws, now that Lebanon has been overpowered by Israel, its military-strategic positions in the face of the constant Israeli threat would grow weaker, and all the more so since the United States is behind the Israeli aggressor.

These aspects of the current situation clearly expose the hypocrisy of the U.S. and Israeli attitude toward the Arabs. American charges against the Soviet Union contain the same measure of hypocrisy. Addressing a Paris news conference before his return to Washington, George Shultz called on the Soviet Union to accept the peace in Lebanon, and try and persuade Syria to withdraw its troops. The state secretary did not mention the fact, however, that the Soviet Union has been working for peace in Lebanon since the first days of the Israeli invation, and demanded that hostilities be terminated and Israeli troops withdrawn from the country, while the United States did everything within its power to cover up and justify Israeli actions. As a result of American policy, Israel has been occupying one-third of Lebanese territory for nearly a year. To save peace does not mean to turn one's back on Arab rights and the need to solve the crucial Palestinian problem.

U.S. - Israeli Interests Served

LD131117 Moscow TASS in English 0902 GMT 13 May 83

[Text] New York May 13 (TASS) -- TASS correspondent Vladimir Kikilo reports:

A separate "peace agreement" with Israel, which has been imposed with the direct participation of the USA upon Lebanon, is aimed first of all at ensuring Tel Aviv's expansionist policy and Washington's imperialist interests in the Middle East. This has been stated in an interview with the TASS correspondent by Neil Saad, spokesman of the Palestinian-Lebanese Committee of the November 29 Coalition, which unites the U.S. public who solidarise with the just struggle of the Arab people of Palestine. The agreement has been concluded to the detriment of the interests of the Lebanese people and sovereignty of Lebanon and pursues the aim of undermining the Palestinian people's struggle for independence and self-determination.

Neil Saad emphasized that the agreement between Israel and Lebanon is an attempt at implementing the notorious plan of U.S. President Ronald Reagan for the Middle East and, like that plan, serves as a continuation of the so-called Camp David "peace" process -- the USA's official policy in the region, policy which is directed towards keeping the state of war there and not towards a search for peace.

The U.S. public figure stressed that President Reagan's so-called Middle East initiative is prompted by the U.S. strategic interests in the Middle East. It does not recognize the Palestine Liberation Organization as the sole legitimate representative of the people of Palestine and denies the people of Palestine of the right to self-determination and to the establishment of an independent state of their own.

Syria's refusal to join in the implementation of the separate deal between Israel and Lebanon is at the same time a blow on the Reagan plan and on the Camp David process. This is why Washington and Tel Aviv are now devising ominous plans for a military aggression against Syria so as to force it and the PLO fighters to withdraw their troops from Lebanon. The obvious threat of an Israeli aggression against Syria still more considerably strains the situation in the Middle East.

If the Middle East peoples want the establishment of a genuine and lasting peace, and not the peace which Tel Aviv and Washington hypocritically discourse upon and which in actual fact means a war, they can achieve that only provided all the sides concerned, including the Palestine Liberation Organization and, undoubtedly, the Soviet Union, participate in the settlement process.

Plan Called U.S.-Israeli 'Cover'

LD141119 Moscow TASS in English 1032 GMT 14 May 83

[Excerpt] Washington May 14 TASS -- Last year's Israeli invasion of Lebanon enabled the United States to gain foothold in one of the most strategically important regions of the Middle East, said Ariel Sharon, former Israeli defense minister, and the person who spearheaded the barbarous aggression against Lebanon last year.

Speaking at the National Press Club in Washington, this high-ranking terrorist who is now one of the closest advisers to Prime Minister Begin did not bother to conceal that Tel Aviv and Washington in actual fact want to perpetuate the occupation of sovereign Lebanon and to make it a springboard for armed interference in the internal affairs of neighboring independent Arab countries and for building up their military presence in that region. Lebanon, Sharon said arrogantly, does not exist politically, and its government is a fictious one which does not control the situation in the country. That is why Israel is not going to withdraw its troops from Lebanon. By saying all this Sharon made it plain that the so-called "Israeli-Lebanese pullout accord" worked out with Washington's mediation effort was nothing else than a cynical cover used by Tel Aviv and Washington to prepare for fresh armed adventures against the Arab states.

Syria Rejects Plan

LD150238 Moscow in Arabic to the Arab World 1530 GMT 14 May 83

[From "Window on the Arab World" Program presented by Aleksandr Timoshkin]

[Text] Syria has officially rejected in form and substance the American draft for an Israeli-Lebanese agreement. This was announced by Syrian President Hafiz al-Asad after his meeting yesterday with Lebanese Foreign Minister Elie Salim.

The Lebanese foreign minister talked with the Syrian president in detail about the substance of the American draft, which Washington describes as a huge diplomatic victory in the Middle East.

President Hafiz al-Asad pointed out that his country's refusal to agree to the American document is based on the principle of consistency of national policy and of general Arab policy. The Syrian president explained that the conditions in the Israeli-Lebanese agreement, which Washington formulated, force Lebanon to abandon all its Arab and international commitments. This goes against the Arab League Charter and the resolutions adopted by the Arab summit conferences. President Hafiz al-asad said that if Lebanon signs an agreement with Israel on the basis of the American draft, the Lebanese authorities would have to change all the laws of the country so that they would go hand in hand with the stipulations of the agreement. The Syrian president also pointed out that the draft which American Secretary of State Shultz has suggested gives Israel the right of full supervision over the skies and territorial waters of Lebanon, and gives the aggressor the leeway to establish military bases on Lebanese territory. The Syrian president said that the American draft forces Lebanon to establish diplomatic relations with Israel and to give Haddad, Israel's agent, the right to control wide areas of the country.

The Syrian president summarized his assessment of the substance and attitude of the American draft, pointing out that its main purpose is to place Lebanon under Israeli control. President Hafiz al-Asad also firmly announced that Syria will not cease to support the fraternal Lebanese people in their struggle against the Zionist aggression and for sovereignty over the whole of their country.

Elie Salim returned to Beirut and submitted a report to the Lebanese president and prime minister. Prime Minister Shafiq al-Wazzan later announced to the press that a resolution had been adopted to form a working group which will undertake active communication with Syria. He justified this Lebanese resolution by noting the need to preserve close cooperation with Syria.

Immediately after receiving the news of the Syrian-Lebanese talks, American President Reagan hastened to give a statement in which he said that he is still hopeful for a change in the rigid Syrian position towards the American draft for an Israeli-Lebanese agreement. The observers consider this statement by the master of the White House to be a confirmation of the continuation of U.S. pressure on Syria in order to force it to surrender. The observers also point out that Tel Aviv began escalating its provocative activities against Syria after the U.S. legislators passed a resolution to increase military aid to Israel, especially gratis aid.

We would like to point out that Syria, as Syrian President Hafiz al-Asad announced, considers the only right approach to a settlement in Lebanon to be the implementation of UN Security Council Resolutions 508 and 509 which call for the unconditional withdrawal of all Israeli forces from Lebanese territory.

Arab Opposition Noted

LD131348 Moscow in Arabic to the Arab World 1530 GMT 12 May 83

[From "Window on the Arab World" Program presented by Aleksey Zlatorunskiy]

[Excerpt] U.S. propaganda is trying to give the impression that George Shultz' mission and the U.S. plan for a Lebanese-Israeli agreement are supported in the Arab world.

But facts disprove these claims completely. We can support this with some examples: Leader of the Lebanese Progressive Socialist Party Walid Junblatt has condemned the U.S.-Lebanese-Israeli talks and has categorically rejected the so-called Reagan plan. The Qatari AR-RAYAH said that the main outcome of Shultz' mission is that he took the safety lock off the bomb which was planted by Israel in Lebanon and it has become possible for it to explode at any moment. The Qatari AL-'AHD said that Washington is trying, under the banner of an Israeli troop withdrawal from Lebanon, to impose a peace on the Arabs that will secure U.S. strategic domination in the region and subjugate the Arabs to U.S. hegemony.

The statement made by Saudi Defense Minister Prince Sultan Ibn 'Abd al'Aziz, who is currently in France, is very significant. The prince said that his country absolutely refuses Washington's demand to put pressure on Syria. He said that the Syrian forces are not aggressive forces and they entered Lebanon at its request. Their evacuation is subject only to the wishes of the Lebanese people.

The Israeli-Lebanese agreement on Lebanon has been strongly criticized by statesmen, journalists, and social organizations in Syria, Palestine, Algeria, the PDRY, and many others.

ISRAEL SAID PREPARING FOR 'NEW AGGRESSION'

LD122155 Moscow TASS in English 1926 GMT 12 May 83

[Text] Beirut May 12 TASS -- TASS correspondent Aleksandr Bogatyrev reports:

The situation remains explosive in the Al-Biqa' Valley, Lebanon, where the Israeli military do not stop even for one day intensive preparations for a new aggression. In the past day the invaders provoked in that area armed clashes with the Syrian contingent of the inter-Arab peace-keeping force in Lebanon. In response to the artillery shelling of peaceful villages, the Syrian troops fired at the positions of the aggressor.

The Israeli force numbering thousands of officers and men is preparing for dealing a decisive blow at Syria. Additional mechanised units, military equipment and armaments are moved to forward positions in the Al-Biqa' Valley, close to the front line. The invaders create numerous depots of fuel, ammunition and military equipment, as well as movable repair shops. Engineering units build new fortifications and military camps, mine approaches to the already fortified areas. Israeli spy planes carry out continuous air reconnaissance of the positions of Syrian troops. The invaders started the construction of another military airfield in the area of Kamed el-Loza. After all the work is completed, heavy transport planes will be able to [words indistinct].

The situation continues to be tense in the mountainous regions of the country [where] the Israeli command moved large units recently. Tel Aviv is busy provoking intercommunal clashes in Ash-Shuf and 'Alayh, thus trying to justify the increase of strength of its troops. Tel Aviv is waiting for another crisis in relations between the Moslem and Cristian communities, which would, in the long run, bring about the division of Lebanon into a number of enclaves. This would meet the interests of Israel, which seeks to establish control over this Arab state.

Meanwhile, high-ranking U.S. emissaries [are] in Beirut one after another. The U.S. Secretary of State Shultz was followed by the Commander of the U.S. Sixth Fleet Roden. He has under his command the war ships which ply along the shores of Lebanon.

TASS REPORTS 'ARAFAT SPEECH ON PLO POLICY

LD160417 Moscow TASS in English 0405 GMT 16 May 83

[Text] Damascus May 16 TASS -- The Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) firmly rejects the U.S. plans for the establishment of U.S. dominance in the Middle East, stated Yasir 'Arafat, chairman of the PLO Executive Committee. Addressing the fighting men of the Palestinian resistance movement, he pointed out the stepped-up escalation of the military preparations of Israeli aggressors in recent days, escalation which is being encouraged by U.S. ruling circles. Yasir 'Arafat emphasized that the Palestinian revolution will continue to struggle for the frustration of Zionist and imperialist plans in the Middle East.

PLO RADIO REPORTS 'ARAFAT MESSAGE FROM USSR LEADERS

JN141044 Baghdad Voice of PLO in Arabic 1615 GMT 14 May 83

[Text] Brother Abu 'Ammar [Yasir 'Arafat], chairman of the PLO Executive Committee and Commander in chief of the Palestinian revolution forces, has received a message from the USSR leaders. The message was conveyed by the USSR ambassador in the Tunisian capital. Our correspondent has learned that the message deals with the developments of the situation in the Arab region.

SOVIET LEBANON ENVOY ON NATIONALS' DEPARTURE

NC101305 Beirut Domestic Service in Arabic 1130 GMT 10 May 83

[Text] The ambassadors of the UN Security Council's five permanent member-states were today summoned to the Republican Palace, where President Shaykh Amin Al-Jumayyil met successively with them. Al-Jumayyil met with Soviet Ambassador Aleksandr Soldatov in the presence of Prime Minister Shafiq Al-Wazzan. They reviewed the latest developments and the Lebanese-Israeli draft agreement.

After meeting with Foreign Minister Dr Elie Salim, Ambassador Soldatov affirmed in a statement he made at the palace that the step taken by the Soviet Union to evacuate its nationals from Lebanon must not bear any political significance.

Through his interpreter, the Soviet ambassador said:

[Begin recording] First we would like to convey a word of thanks to His Excellency the president, the prime minister, and the foreign minister for the discussions.

[Question] Mr Ambassador, President Al-Jumayyil received you within the framework of summoning the ambassadors of the UN Security Council's five permanent member-states. Can you tell us the nature of the talks in these circumstances?

[Answer] It was to exchange information.

[Question] What is the nature of the reports about the departure of Soviet nationals from Beirut and the possibility of their departing Syria and Amman? Will other nationals be leaving Beirut soon?

[Answer] It appears that there is a misunderstanding. We usually send children and Soviet students to participate in children's camps in the Soviet Union for the duration of the summer school vacation. This is what we have done this year, too. It appears that this action has been interpreted incorrectly. For your information, the other foreign embassies in Lebanon have so far not returned their children to Beirut. We do this every year. It should be noted that previous years, unlike this year, were worst in respect of the security situation.

[Question] Last year you sent them around the end of June, not at the beginning of May.

[Answer] It was around the beginning of June.

[Question] Can you tell us which embassy's children have not returned to Lebanon?

[Answer] It appears that there is only the Soviet Embassy. [sentence as heard]

[Question] Your Excellency said that there are children belonging to other embassies who have been evacuated from Lebanon.

[Answer] [Words indistinct] after the Israeli invasion.

[Question] In a statement yesterday Minister Khaddam said that if war breaks out, the Soviet Union will be committed to its stances and will support Syria. Do you expect a war in Al-Biqa' soon, and will the Soviet Union get involved in it?

[Answer] The last time two persons posed such a hypothetical question, we answered that we do not reply to such hypothetical questions. However, the information media of a certain state attributed an answer to this question to me which did not exist at all.

[Question] Mr Ambassador, we have not posed a hypothetical question. It was Minister Khaddam who spoke of the possibility of war breaking out.

[Another Question] Mr Ambassador, there is a Lebanese-Israeli draft agreement for the withdrawal of non-Lebanese forces from Lebanon. The Syrians have rejected the agreement. What is the Soviet Union's stance regarding this particular subject and regarding the evacuation of all foreign forces from Lebanon at the level of Syria facilitating this?

[Answer] Our stance is supporting the withdrawal of all foreign forces from Lebanon.

[Question] Does the Soviet Union support the Lebanese-Israeli draft agreement now that the Israeli government has approved it?

[Answer] Our stance regarding this problem is known. We believe that the Israeli aggressor should withdraw from Lebanon immediately and unconditionally. We adhere to this stance in particular.

[Question] However, the Israeli side is demanding a simultaneous withdrawal with the Syrian Army.

[Answer] We believe that the aggressor should not have been here. Therefore, he should not raise complaints. This is what we spoke to you about. As for your question, we believe that all foreign forces should withdraw from Lebanon unconditionally. [end recording]

ANGOLA'S DOS SANTOS IN MOSCOW FOR VISIT

Visit Previewed

LD152151 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 15 May 83

[Text] At the invitation of the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and the Soviet Government, Jose Eduardo dos Santos, president of the People's Republic of Angola and chairman of the MPLA [Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola] Labor Party will arrive on a working friendly visit in Moscow tomorrow.

Dos Santos, the official report stresses, is making a great contribution to the development of Angolan-Soviet relations. He has often visited the Soviet Union as part of official Angolan delegations. In 1979 he was in the USSR on an official visit and took part in the work of the 26th CPSU Congress. On the international scene, the People's Republic of Angola consistently adopts anti-imperialist and anticolonialist positions and follows a course toward consolidation of peace and international security, and support of the national liberation struggle of peoples, strengthening of African unity, taking active part in the Nonaligned Movement. Jose Eduardo dos Santos is known in the Soviet Union as an eminent political figure of Africa, a loyal continuer of the cause of Antonio Agostinho Neto, the founder of the MPLA Labor Party and of the People's Republic of Angola.

The Soviet people welcome Jose Eduardo dos Santos and in his person the friendly Angolan people, and express confidence that his visit will promote further development and strengthening of relations between the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of Angola.

Pre-Visit Interview

LD141325 Moscow TASS in English 1226 GMT 14 May 83

[Text] Luanda May 14 TASS -- The Relations between the People's Republic of Angola and the Soviet Union are developing exclusively fruitfully. This was stated in a talk with Soviet journalists by chairman of the MPLA-Workers' Party, President of the People's Republic of Angola Jose Eduardo dos Santos.

In the period of the struggle for national liberation the Soviet Union displayed profound friendship and solidarity with the people, oppressed and exploited by colonialists. After the proclamation of independence and formation of the MPLA-Workers' Party our links acquired a new character -- these were the links between the ruling parties and independent states.

Touching upon the situation in the south of Africa, Dos Santos noted that the apartheid regime continues the policy aimed at destabilising the situation in countries in the south of Africa. Using its Armed Forces, the apartheid regime conducts an undeclared war against neighbouring states. A considerable part of the south Angolan province of Cunene is still occupied by South African Army. Racists of the Republic of South Africa use traitors whom they train, supply with weapons and ammunition, and then send to neighbouring countries for terroristic and bandit actions against civilians, for subversive acts at economic and military structures.

The state of affairs in the region is the cause of our grave concern. We conduct the policy of peace, and put forward constructive proposals to enable Namibia attain as soon as possible independence in accordance with the U.N. Security Council's resolution. That would enable to attain relaxation of tension in the south of Africa and in the long run would promote liquidation of the apartheid regime.

We firmly denounce the aggressive policy conducted by imperialism, with the United States at the head, said the Angolan leader. We denounce the policy of the arms race and will exert every effort to disclose that policy. We do not want the south of Africa to become an arena of war that would draw other countries which would naturally imperil world peace. We cannot treat indifferently militaristic preparations.

Answering the question on the attitude to the new Soviet peace initiatives, Dos Santos said: The Angolan State and the MPLA-Workers' Party support the peaceful policy of the Soviet Union. The struggle for peace is the duty of all people of good will. In that struggle the Soviet Union plays the vanguard role. We denounce the cold war policy which is contrary to the interests of all peoples of the world. The struggle for peace is directly linked with defending the right of the oppressed peoples to freedom and independence, the right to construct their relations with all other countries on the basis of the principles of equality and peaceful coexistence.

Supporting the peaceful policy of the Soviet Union, we denounce imperialists' attempts to mislead the world public by allegations that the USSR and other socialist countries exploit the national wealth of developing states. There is a fundamental difference between socialist and capitalist countries. Socialist countries are characterized by the striving for freedom, justice and peace, struggle against exploitation of man by man, while imperialist powers seek to restore capitalist and colonial order.

The reactionary bourgeois propaganda seeks to present things in a way that allegedly Cuban and Soviet comrades pursue some colonialist aims. This is being done to shield real colonialists. The socialist countries uphold the rightful cause, they side with the oppressed peoples which is reaffirmed by the history of the national liberation struggle of Angola. There is no doubt that the vanguard role of the USSR and other countries of the socialist community is the decisive factor in defending world peace.

Arrives in Moscow

LD160837 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0800 GMT 16 May 83

[Text] Jose Eduardo dos Santos, chairman of the MPLA-Labor Party, president of the People's Republic of Angola, arrived in Moscow today for a working friendly visit at the invitation of the CPSU Central Committee, the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Soviet Government. At the airport he was met by Comrade Gromyko, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee, first deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR and minister of foreign affairs; Comrade Ustinov, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and minister of defense; Comrade Kuznetsov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; Comrade Ponomarev, candidate member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; and by other officials.

U.S., RSA CONDUCTING 'WAR' AGAINST ANGOLA

PM121444 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 12 May 83 First Edition p 3

[R. Vasilyev article: "Undeclared War Against Angola"]

[Text] The war being waged by the Pretoria authorities against Angola has already caused that young independent state tremendous human casualties and material losses.

As (M. Kholness), director of the Angola Information Center, writes in the brochure "The Apartheid Regime's War Against Angola," published in London, from 1975 to the beginning of 1983 Angola suffered material damage calculated at over $10 billion. The South African cutthroats use the territory of illegally-occupied Namibia as a bridgehead for the invasion of Angola, the brochure points out, and are burning down civilian homes, killing livestock, and destroying everything that they come across. During these years thousands of utterly blameless Angolan civilians have died at the racist murderers' hands. Hundreds of wells have been poisoned, and large areas of crops are destroyed year after year. The South African military is particularly violent in those areas of the south Angolan province of Cunene which it occupied after large-scale aggression in summer 1981 and 1982.

An explosive situation persists to the present day on the Angolan-Namibian border. According to information received, the recist Pretoria regime is harboring plans for wide-ranging new aggression against Angola. To that end, the Mozambique newspaper COMBATE reports, South Africa is building up its troops and military hardware both at military bases in Namibia along the Angolan border and on captured Angolan territory. The newspaper writes that, in all, the racists have concentrated nearly 25,000 men in that area, including 5,000 servicemen on Angolan soil itself. COMBATE attests that this "invasion group" has at its disposal modern offensive equipment -- including tanks, aircraft, self-propelled artillery, and missiles -- supplied to the racists by Western countries.

What, then, is the aim of the aggression being schemed by the racist ringleaders against Angola? Their intention is to expand the occupation of southern Angola as far as Lubango -- the administrative center of Huila Province -- to enable the anti-Angolan puppet grouping UNITA [National Union for the Total Liberation of Angola] to base its headquarters there. According to Pretoria's scheme, the next move is to be to proclaim in the captured "buffer zone" a pseudo-independent state under that terrorist organization's control. According to a report in the South African RAND DAILY MAIL, J. Savimbi, UNITA's ringleader, has "already begun talks with the Pretoria authorities on the creation of such a state."

The existence of such plans proves for all to see that South Africa's racist elite is gambling not only on military force in its undeclared war against Angola but also on subversive and terrorist activity by the UNITA grouping.

...Camouflaged armored personnel carriers slipped out through the gates of South Africa's Rundu military base located in Namibia. They were following a convoy of heavily-laden trucks which they were to protect along their entire route. The destination of these special transporters was an area of the Angolan-Namibian border where a UNITA support camp was stationed. Under their tarpaulins the trucks were carrying arms and ammunition for that anti-Angolan grouping's bandit formations which are carrying out armed raids against Angolan territory.

The episode, cited in a dispatch from Namibia by THE NEW YORK TIMES, is very typical. From the very first days of its existence UNITA has been and still is maintained by the South African and U.S. special services. In the fulfillment of its imperialist masters' instructions, the UNITA leadership, in conjuction with South Africa and the U.S. CIA, made unavailing efforts as far back as 1975-76 to prevent the establishment of people's power in Angola. But the aggressors and interventionists suffered a severe defeat and were driven out of Angolan territory. With the South African authorities' consent, the UNITA remnants established a base in northern Namibia where they lived in obscurity.

The coming to power of the Reagan administration in the United States and its course of "constructive rapprochement" with racist South Africa helped to revive UNITA.

In an attempt to thwart the granting of genuine independence to Namibia, Washington and Pretoria selected as the target of their attacks an Angola whose principled position on this issue makes its difficult for the racists and their overseas protectors to implement their neocolonialist schemes.

It was then, too, that the anti-Angolan puppet grouping UNITA was again restored to the limelight. Several secret meetings took place between U.S. envoys and UNITA leaders -- first in Morocco and later in South Africa. But the disguise was soon abandoned and UNITA ringleader J. Savimbi was received in Washington virtually with open arms. As a result of those contacts and Savimbi's expressed readiness to participate in an undeclared war against Angola large consignments of weapons and money began to be placed at his disposal. Under the terms of an accord with South Africa, 20 special camps have been set up in northern Namibia where UNITA bandits receive training in sabotage and are equipped with weapons prior to being sent to Angola. U.S., Israeli, and even Chilean advisers act as their instructors. And the weapons that they receive are stamped with the markings of the United States, Israel, and a number of West European countries.

It is significant that Washington intends to supplement the pressure on Angola from the south with pressure applied from the north. This is attested by the results of a U.S. military delegation's visit to Zaire at the beginning of March. According to information from Libya's JANA agency, the visit by high-ranking Pentagon representatives was designed to accelerate the transformation of Zaire into a bridgehead from which the United States can step up military-political pressure on Africa's independent countries, Angola above all. With that aim in mind, there was a discussion of the question of reviving the activity of the National Front for the Liberation of Angola[FNLA] another anti-Angolan grouping -- headed by H. Roberto, long a paid agent of the U.S. CIA.

The undeclared war being waged by South Africa and the United States and the plots that they are weaving against Angola, of course, are making it very difficult to build a new life, as the Angolan people are doing. But they are fully determined to defend the Angolan revolution's gains and to rebuff its external and internal enemies. This just struggle by the Angolan people and consistent foreign policy course of the Angolan Government are meeting with complete understanding and support in the international arena. Expressing their solidarity with Angola, the Soviet Union and the other socialist community countries are giving it concrete assistance and support in its difficult struggle against imperialism and racism.

FRONTLINE STATES HOLD DAR ES SALAAM MEETING

LD141429 Moscow in Ndebele to Zimbabwe 1730 GMT 14 May 83

[Yevgeniy Stepanov commentary]

[Text] A meeting of the Frontline States neighboring South Africa has been held in Dar es Salaam, the capital of Tanzania. The leaders of Angola, Botswana, Mozambique, Tanzania, Zambia, and Zimbabwe participated.

The main issue on the agenda was the question of the freedom and independence of Namibia and also the situation in southern Africa following the increase in harassment of independent states by the South African Government.

South Afr[illegible] lead to Namibia's independence. [illegible] is any resumption of talks on Namibia's independence, Cuban military personnel in Angola must be withdrawn.

The linking of these two separate issues has presented complicated problems, and is in conflict with the UN Security Council Resolution 435. The provisions of the resolution provide for the removal of South African troops from Namibia, followed by internationally supervised elections. But the United States and South Africa have consistently refused to heed the provisions of his resolution.

It appears that in the next few days the assistant secretary of state for African Affairs, Dr Chester Crocker, will visit Pretoria; he is to be accompanied by the assistant secretary of state for political affairs, Mr Eagleberger. According to informed sources the purpose of their visit is to advise the South Africans to remain in Namibia and to persuade neighboring countries to accept the Pretoria-Washington line.

The Frontline States fail to see any reason for the delay in granting immediate independence to Namibia; they also reject the whole idea of linking Namibia's independence to the issue of the presence of Cuban military personnel in Angola. The participants urged that South Africa soon withdraw its troops from Namibia and cease harassment of Mozambique and Lesotho.

The situation in the countries neighboring South Africa is relevant to the solution of regional problems. The UN Security Council will discuss this situation on 23 May. Despite the unceasing attacks unleashed by South African racists of the Pretoria regime, and U.S. support for this the Frontline States are determined to achieve Namibia's independence.

Many countries are involved in this struggle, including the socialist states. The application of economic sanctions could make South Africa toe the line.

USSR COUNCIL OF MINISTERS GREETINGS TO UNECA

PM101253 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Apr 83 First Edition p 1

[USSR Council of Ministers' greetings to UNECA -- date not given; a report on greetings was published in the 2 May Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, page J 2]

[Text] To the participants in the jubilee, 18th session of the UN Economic Commission for Africa:

We cordially greet the participants in the jubilee, 18th session of the UN Economic Commission for Africa [ECA], who have gathered in the Ethiopian capital.

In the course of quarter of a century the work of this authoritative organization, which now unites 50 independent African states, has won widespread recognition. the Monrovia strategy for the economic development of Africa and the Lagos action program for implementing this strategy were elaborated with the direct participation of the commission. Their adoption marked the beginning of a new stage in the difficult struggle for the economic liberation of Africa, for creating a national economy and for developing the base sectors of industry, agriculture, transport, and communications.

The liquidation of many colonies, which radically changed the political map of the African Continent and the very face of Africa, was an event of historic significance. Along the road of independence much has been done to boost the economy and for the flowering of indigenous culture and art.

The successes of the African countries and peoples would undoubtedly have been even more pronounced had international imperialism not tried to regain its lost positions in Africa and to bind its peoples with new fetters of neocolonialist dependence in order to retain African countries as a kind of "hinterland" to the world capitalist economy and to be able to exploit Africa's natural wealth virtually unchecked.

In defence of all freedom-loving Africa, the imperialist circles are increasingly openly using the racist South African regime for interference in the internal affairs of sovereign African states and for the struggle against the African liberation movement and are obstructing the implementation of the UN decisions on granting independence to Namibia.

The Soviet Union consistently opposes attempts to divide Africa into "spheres of influence" and champions the legitimate right of the people of every country to decide their internal affairs themselves, without outside interference. It resolutely and invariably sides with those who even today have the struggle for freedom and independence, are forced to rebuff an aggressor's onslaught or are threatened with aggression. The Soviet Union steadfastly supports the African states' struggle for economic independence, complete sovereignty over their natural resources, the restructuring of international economic relations on a just and democratic basis and the establishment of a new international economic order. Aid and assistance to African countries in their struggle to overcome economic backwardness is a principled policy of our state. We intend to continue to develop mutually advantageous equal cooperation and trade, economic, scientific, and technical contacts with those of the continent's liberated countries which show an interest in this.

In the conditions of the current increase in the complexity of the international situation caused by the policy of imperialist aggressive circles, questions of averting the threat of war and curbing the arms race are more urgent than ever before. They affect all countries without exception. The Soviet Union believes that the difficulties and tension marking the present-day international situation can and must be overcome by the joint efforts of peace-loving peoples. Mankind cannot reconcile itself indefinitely to the arms race and wars unless it wants to put its future at stake. Progress toward disarmament would make it possible to release vast sums by freezing, not to mention reducing, military budgets. Some of the funds currently swallowed up by weapons production which could be saved in this way, would be spent on assistance to developing states.

We welcome the energetic actions by independent African states for peace, for turning Africa into a nuclear-free zone and the Indian Ocean and the Mediterranean into zones of peace, and for the speediest complete elimination of the last hotbeds of colonialism and racism.

We wish the participants in the 18th ECA session success in their work and express the hope that its results will serve the socioeconomic progress of peaceful and independent Africa.

[Signed] USSR Council of Ministers

CUBAN OFFICIAL VISITS USSR AVIATION MINISTER

PM131417 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 May 83 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Talk Held"]

[Text] A meeting took place 11 May between B.P. Bugayev, USSR minister of civil aviation, and G. Garcia Frias, member of the Communist Party of Cuba Central Committee Politburo, vice president of the Cuban State Council and Council of Ministers, and minister of transporation. He is in the USSR on a working visit.

U.S. NICARAGUAN INTERFERENCE CONDEMNED AT UN

LD131708 Moscow World Service in English 1300 GMT 11 May 83

[Text] World public attention has been focused in the past few days on a discussion in the United Nations Security Council of the intervention of American mercenaries in Nicaragua. This is the second time within a month and a half that the UN Security Council deals with the threat for Nicaragua and the whole of Central Amercia, that the Amercian aggression may expand, writes our commentator Leonid Levchenko.

You may recall that back at the end of March the Security Council heard delegates from about 50 countries, an absolute majority of whom denounced the imperial claims of the Reagan administration to dictate its terms to the Nicaraguan people. to unceremoniously interfere in the affairs of a sovereign state. However, in what is a challenge to the world community, Washington keeps following a line for the use of brute force. along with political and economic pressure against Nicaragua.

No one is deluded today by attempts of the Reagan administration to evade responsibility and to picture the intervention of U.S. mercenaries as an internal affair of Nicaragua. As the foreign minister of Nicaragua, Miguel D'Escoto, has reaftirmed in the UN Security Council, it is the U.S. Government that has organized the aggression, having trained and armed the hired killers, real riffraff whom President Reagan has described as (much as) freedom fighters. It is with the help of such fighters. so-called, said the Nicaraguan foreign minister. that Washington is trying to impose on the people of Nicaragua its own version of supposed democracy. This is actually a war the United States is waging against that republic. The U.S. Administration is stepping up economic sanctions against it. Now, for example, a White House spokesman has announced a considerable cutback in the American quota of sugar imports from Nicaragua. This is an old trick. Back in the early sixties Washington used the method to try to strangle the Republic of Cuba with an economic blockade. but nothing came out of it because of the fraternal solidarity and support extended to Cuba by the Soviet Union and other countries within the socialist community

In its efforts to stay independent Nicaragua has on its side today the solidarity of all progressive forces of the world. In statements made currently, political and public leaders of various countries strongly denounce the intervention by Washington and call for a peaceful political settlement of the problems of Central America. The first step toward such a settlement should be a stop to all aggressive actions against Nicaragua, the demand is contained also in a draft resolution tabled in the UN Security Council by a group of nonaligned states.

As for the Soviet Union, it has repeatedly declared its firm conviction that it is possible to promote peace in Central America only by respecting the sovereign right of every nation to determine its destiny itself without outside interference.

SUPREME SOVIET PRESIDIUM HOLDS 11 MAY SESSION

IZVESTIYA Report

PM142243 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 May 83 Morning Edition pp 1-2

[TASS report: "USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Session"]

[Text] A routine session of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium was held in the Kremlin on 11 May under the chairmanship of V.V. Kuznetsov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

The Presidium examined the question of the progress of the fulfillment of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and USSR Council of Ministers resolution on further increasing soviets' role in economic building. The reports by N.K. Baybakov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and V.F. Garbuzov, USSR minister of finance, noted that, implementing the decisions of the 26th party congress and subsequent CPSU Central Committee plenums and also the aforementioned resolution, soviets have intensified work relating to exercising leadership of state, economic, social and cultural building; ensuring comprehensive economic and social development within republics, krays, oblasts, okrugs, rayons, and cities; and increasing social production efficiency. Soviets' coordinating and monitoring activities have broadened and their influence on the work of enterprises and organizations and on improving Soviet people's living and working conditions has increased. This has been helped by measures currently being implemented by the USSR Gosplan and the USSR Ministry of Finance to improve planning and management at territorial level and broaden local soviets' financial potential.

Deputy A.M. Kalashnikov delivered a coreport on behalf of the USSR Supreme Soviet chambers' plan and budget commissions. He noted that the implementation of the measures envisaged by the resolution enables soviets to elaborate more detailed and comprehensive economic and social development plans incorporating the indicators of enterprises and organizations under higher jurisdiction, make rational use of manpower and material and financial resources, increase production of consumer goods, and develop housing construction and the public service sphere.

S.N. Imashev, chairman of the Kazakh SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; N.F. Tatarchuk, chairman of Krasnoyarsk Krayispolkim; and A.M. Voropayev, chairman of Voronezh Oblispolkom; spoke about the specific positive results achieved when soviets exercise their increased powers in the economic leadership sphere and about the practical problems arising.

It was noted at the session that certain ministries and departments are failing to ensure that enterprises and organizations under their jurisdiction strictly adhere to the established procedure for elaborating their relevant plan indicators and coordinating them with soviets and do not always take account of their views on questions relating to land use, the construction of housing and social and consumer service amenities, consumer goods production, the more efficient use of manpower, and nature conservation.

Stress was paid on soviets' increasing responsibility for getting consumer goods onto the market most expeditiously and replenishing commodity resources. Soviets must draw up aggregate plans for the production of goods needed by the public for every enterprise in their territory.

The resolution adopted by the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium draws the attention of soviets and their organs to the need to pay constant attention to improving the leadership of state, economic, social, and cultural building and to intensify organizational and educational work aimed at ensuring the successful implementation of the decisions of the 26th party congress and the CPSU Central Committee May and November (1982) plenums and the fulfillment of the plan for 1983 and the 11th 5-Year Plan period as a whole. It calls for the fuller exercise of the rights granted by the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and USSR Council of Ministers resolution on further increasing soviets' role in economic building in order to ensure comprehensive economic and social development in their territory and coordinate the activities of every enterprise and organization without parochialism and in strict conformity with state interests. Soviets, ministries, and departments should seek balance in the sector and territorial management of the national economy and strict adherence to the established procedure for examining and coordinating plans and give every assistance to labor collectives in the fulfillment of targets and contractual obligations.

Union republic Supreme Soviet presidiums are instructed to regularly examine questions connected with the implementation of measures to further increase soviets' role in economic, social, and cultural building and to show particular concern for agroindustrial associations and give them all-around assistance in fulfilling the Food Program.

The USSR Gosplan, the USSR Ministry of Finance, USSR ministries and departments, and union republic councils of ministers have been given corresponding instructions.

The Presidium then examined the question of the work done of soviets in the Bashkir ASSR among the public in their place of residence. A report by F.V. Sultanov, chairman of the Bashkir ASSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, analyzed the soviets' work among the public. He pointed out that work done in people's place of residence is based on a differentiated approach to various groups in the population taking into account their job and age characteristics and living conditions and also the multinational composition of the republic's population.

Citing the example of the soviets in the Bashkir ASSR's Dyurtyulinskiy Rayon and of the board and social organizations of the Unysh kolkhoz, of which he is chairman, Deputy M.M. Galiyev, who took part in preparing the question, discussed various ways of working among the public and the shortcomings which exist in this work.

The speeches by A.F. Vatchenko, chairman of the Ukranian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and A.S. Barkauskas, chairman of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, discussed the experience of work done by soviets in the Ukraine and Lithuania in the citizens' places of residence. M.Z. Shakirov, first secretary of Bashkir Obkom and member of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, devoted his speech to questions relating to the party's leadership of soviets' work among the public.

The resolution adopted directed the Bashkir ASSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and local soviets in the republic to ensure a further improvement in work among the public in their places of residence, taking accumulated experience into account and to seek working people's active involvement in the implementation of the decisions of the 26th party congress and the CPSU Central Committee May and November (1982) plenums.

Attention was drawn to the need to implement additional measures to intensify ideological and political education work, gearing it to the achievement of good end results in fulfilling economic and social development plans, to constantly increase the ideological thrust of measures being implemented, and to pay more attention to questions of patriotic and internationalist education.

Everything must be done to strengthen ties with the public; to increase the role of ispolkoms, permament commissions, deputies' groups, deputies, and social initiative organs in improving the performance of enterprises and organizations concerned with housing and municipal services, trade, consumer services, transport, landscaping and the provision of other amenities, and the upkeep of the housing stock; and to intensify organizational and mass political work among the public relating to the fulfillment of the Food Program and the development of private subsidiary plots.

More rational use must be made of cultural and educational establishments and sports facilities, regardless of which department they come under, and their material resources must be further expanded and consolidated.

Effective measures must be taken to staff cultural and educational establishments with skilled cadres and create the necessary living and working conditions for them. Coordination of the activity of enterprises and organizations engaged in work among the public must be improved, and collaboration with trade union, Komsomol, and other public organizations must be broadened.

Efforts must be made to ensure the fulfillment of plans for the comprehensive development of residential areas, at the same time adhering to the established norms for the provision of schools, child-care facilities, hospitals, trade and consumer service enterprises, and other facilities; and fuller use of funds earmarked for these purposes by kolkhozes, sovkhozes, associations, and enterprises.

It is deemed necessary to focus the efforts of state organs and the public on strengthening discipline and law and order, to resolutely intensify the drive against drunkenness, parasitism, hooliganism, and other antisocial phenomena, and to persistently improve work on juvenile crime prevention.

The session examined the USSR draft air code. A report on this question was delivered by B.P. Bugayev, USSR minister of civil aviation. I.Ye. Klimenko, chairman of the Soviet of the Union Transport and Communications Commission, delivered an address on behalf of the Transport and Communications Commissions and the Legislative Proposals Commission to which the draft code had been submitted for their conclusions [za zaklyucheniye].

The session participants stressed that the code proceeds from the tasks facing air transport, reflects the current level of development of aviation and its material and technical base, and makes stipulations concerning improving the service offered to the public, flight safety, and the operation of civil aircraft, airfields, and airports.

The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium adopted a decree confirming the USSR air code, taking account of the amendments and clarifications submitted by the chambers' permanent commissions.

The session examined questions relating to the convocation of the 8th Session of the Supreme Soviet, 10th Convocation, and a number of other questions relating of state life.

Taking part in the discussion of the items on the agenda were CPSU Central Committee Politburo members V.V. Grishin and G.V. Romanov; USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Deputy Chairmen I.Ye. Polyakov, K.A. Khalilov, P.Ya. Strautmanis, and B.Ye. Sarkisov; T.N. Kentesashvili, secretary of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; and the leaders of a number of ministries and departments.

Decision on Supreme Soviet Meeting

PM141629 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 May 83 First Edition p 1

["USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Decree on the Convening of the USSR Supreme Soviet"]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium decrees that:

The 8th Session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, 10th Convocation, be convened on 16 June 1983 in the city of Moscow.

[Signed] V. Kuznetsov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium

T. Menteshashvili, secretary of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium

Moscow, Kremlin, 14 May 1983

GOVERNMENT ENVIRONMENTAL COMMISSION MEETS 12 MAY

LD130600 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1830 GMT 12 May 83

[Text] A regular session of the Commission of the Presidium of the USSR Council of Ministers on the Protection of the Environment and the Rational Use of Natural Resources took place today. The commission examined the measures being taken by Gosgrazhdanstroy [State Committee for Civil Construction and Architecture] for the conservation of nature and for the drawing up of normative documents in the sphere of housing and civil construction, general plans of towns and rural inhabited areas, and plans for the detailed mapping out and construction of residential areas. It was noted that the work done by Gosgrazhdanstroy in this direction still does not fully meet the present-day requirements. Gosgrazhdanstroy has been instructed to step up the review of out-of-date normative documents, taking into account the achievements of science and technology and leading expertise in the conservation of nature, and to step up supervision of nature conservation measures.

VALERIY REPIN TRIAL CONTINUES IN LENINGRAD

LD131918 Moscow TASS in English 1533 GMT 13 May 83

[Text] Leningrad May 13 TASS -- Aims that are remote from the sham charity under the mask of which the so called "aid fund for political prisoners in the USSR and their families" operates, were exposed at the trial in Leningrad of the former distributer of the "fund" Valeriy Repin. The witnesses who testified today, among them Lev Volokhonskiy, Anatoliy Ivanov, Aleksandr Shchepkov and Vyacheslav Dolinin, confirmed the charges of criminal activity made against Repin. In their testimony they cited concrete facts of Repin's criminal activity. Witness Lev Volokhonskiy, for instance, said that Repin had paid him out of the "fund" for his trips in the country connected with the collection of all sorts of slanderous information. Repin's activity in the collection of information was determined by the hostile directedness of the "questionaire" that he got from abroad. Similar testimony was given also by the other witnesses. They testified further that all these materials were went abroad through diplomatic channels provided by foreign consulates. "I know my husband sufficiently well to believe the wholeheartedness of his repentance and the sincerity of his testimony", the court was told by Yelena Repina, the defendant's wife, who was summoned to court as a witness. The trial in Leningrad will be continued on Monday, May 16.

COUNCIL OF MINISTERS VIEWS AGRICULTURAL PROBLEMS

PM130917 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 May 83 Morning Edition p 2

[TASS report: "To Prepare for the Harvest in Good Time"]

[Text] Progress in the preparations by kolkhozes and sovkhozes for gathering the harvest and for procuring fodder was examined 10 May at a routine session of the USSR Council of Ministers Presidium Commission on Questions of the Agro-Industrial Complex. Reports on this question were delivered by L.I. Khitrun, chairman of the USSR State Committee for the Supply of Production Equipment for Agriculture; V.K. Mesyats, USSR minister of agriculture, and leaders of relevant USSR industrial ministries and departments.

It was pointed out at the commission that in many parts of the country the development of agricultural crops is proceeding faster than usual this year. In this connection the USSR Ministry of Agriculture, the USSR State Committee for the Supply of Production Equipment for Agriculture, the USSR Ministry of the Fruit and Vegetable Industry, the USSR Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources, the commissions on questions of the agro-industrial complex of the union republics' councils of ministers presidiums, and republic (ASSR), kray, and oblast agro-industrial association councils, taking account of the conditions which develop, are obliged to take additional measures to complete in the very near future the repair of all fodder-harvesting equipment, silage and haylage installations, and storehouses for coarse fodder and haylage and also to accelerate the commissioning of such projects as provided for in the plan for 1983.

Attention was drawn to the need to step up the pace of preparation of grain-harvesting combines and other machines, particularly equipment for harvesting corn. Targets were determined to ensure the maximum readiness of trucks and truck-and tractor-drawn trailers by the start of the mass harvest. The Ministries of Tractor and Agricultural Machine-Building, Machine-Building for Animal Husbandry and Fodder Production, and the Automotive Industry and other ministries are entrusted with finding a way to increase the production of individual types of spare parts and their delivery to agriculture.

The leaders of the USSR Ministry of Rural Construction were seriously criticized for failing to fulfill plans for the construction and commissioning of capacities on agro-industrial complex projects. They were reprimanded for rectifying extremely slowly the state of affairs with regard to improving the use of capacities for the production of precast reinforced concrete, carpentry products, and other types of materials and structures. The ministry is failing to effectively eliminate shortcomings in the construction of projects in the RSFSR Non-Chernozem Zone.

Note was taken of the statement by V.D. Danilenko, USSR minister of rural construction, that subordinate enterprises and organizations will take measures to overcome laggardness in construction in the countryside.

The question of the fulfillment of CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers decisions on the further development of rice-growing was examined. The relevant organizations were entrusted with accelerating the modernization of existing irrigation systems with a view to improving the yield and quality of rice, and also with resolving the questions of increasing the production of more sophisticated equipment and effective herbicides.

Measures to increase hemp production on kolkhozes and sovkhozes were also discussed.

To satisfy the growing public demand for pelmeni [Siberian-style pasta], the need to increase production of this product, particularly in large cities and industrial centers, was pointed out to the USSR Ministries of Meat and Daily Industry and Trade. The Ministries of Machine-building for Light and Food Industry and Household Appliances and Instrument-Making, Automation Equipment, and Control Systems must ensure the accelerated manufacture of technological equipment for this purpose.

AGRICULTURAL REVIEW DETAILS SPRING SOWING WORK

Nationwide Progress

PM131154 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 May 83 Morning Edition p 1

[O. Pavlov "Agricultural Review": "On the Spring Field"]

[Text] According to data of the USSR Central Statistical Administration, by Monday, 9 May, spring crops had been sown on 75.8 million hectares in the country, including grain and pulse crops (excluding corn) on 41.5 million hectares and corn for grain on 4.2 million hectares. Pulse crops occupied 4.9 million hectares. Millet had been sown on 699,000 hectares and buckwheat on 293,000 hectares. Rice had been sown on 351,000 hectares.

Sunflowers occupied 3.75 million hectares, sugar beets 3.4 million hectares and fiber flax 768,000 hectares.

Potatoes had been planted on 1.6 million hectares and vegetables on 822,000 hectares.

Fodder crops had been sown on 15.7 million hectares and fodder root crops and cucurbits on 1.4 million hectares.

The May Day holiday period was also a working period. In any event fieldwork did not stop anywhere. In those places where the sowing campaign has finished, farmers are actively tending the shoots.

On Tuesday, 10 May, Ukrainian kolkhozes and sovkhozes finished sowing corn. Among forage grain crops, the Ukraine has assigned the target area -- almost 2 million hectares -- to corn.

The chief special feature of this year's sowing season is the mass introduction of industrial methods. In accordance with the republic's Agrokompleks targeted program, 8 out of every 10 hectares of plantations will be cultivated without using manual labor. Over 7,000 specialized detachments and links have been allocated for the republic's corn field. Having organized their work on the basis of the collective contract method, machine operators are ensuring the strict observance of agrotechnical requirements. The optimum quotas of mineral fertilizers and herbicides are being introduced simultaneously with the seeds into well leveled and well cultivated soil. Corn growers are making careful use of irrigation possibilities. More than 100 links in the Crimea and dozens of collectives in Odessa, Kherson and a number of other oblasts have planned to obtain 100 or more quintals of corn grain from irrigated land.

The Ukraine is now sowing soybeans, mainly by industrial methods, moreover, and buckwheat and rice. The pace of work is rapid.

Once again farmers have been gladdened by the rain which fell very opportunely in many regions of the commodity production of grain and other important agricultural crops. Up to 25-50 mm of rain fell during the week in Moldavia, most oblasts of the Ukraine, the North Caucasus, the Central Chernozem Region and a number of oblasts of Kazakhstan. There was no rain in Belorussia, the Baltic Region and the Non-Chernozem Zone. But the ground here is still quite moist.

During the week, the farmers of Orenburg and Aktyubinsk Oblasts sowed the most grain -- 574,000 and 572,000 hectares, respectively. During the last 7 days, spring crops have been sown on 10.7 million hectares throughout the country as a whole, including grain and pulse crops on 6 million hectares, which is somewhat less than in previous weeks. However, this does not mean a slump in fieldwork. Simply, as has already been mentioned, the sowing has finished in many regions, while in the east beyond the Urals it is just beginning.

Of the spring crops, barley occupied the largest area -- 18.8 million hectares -- which is 2.3 million hectares more than at the same time last year. Moreover, as specialists of the USSR Ministry of Agriculture note, the addition has been achieved on the basis of the judicious improvement of the structure of sowing areas. They have been extended precisely in those areas where barley produces a higher yield than other cereals. Wheat still "holds its own" on the Kazakh Virgin Lands and in Siberia.

The sowing of the valuable hulled crops -- buckwheat and millet -- is proceeding at a more rapid pace than last year. The sowing of buckwheat has finished in Zaporoshye, Dnepropetrovsk and Kherson Oblasts. The rice growers of the Kuban have nearly completed the sowing. Kolkhozes and sovkhozes of the Ukraine, Lithuania, Estonia and Kirghizia have fulfilled the target for sowing pulse crops. Incidentally, these crops now occupy 741,000 hectares -- more than on the same date last year.

Farms are introducing industrial methods energetically. Thus, of the 4.2 million hectares of corn grain, 3,050 hectares have been sown "industrially." Sturdy shoots have already been obtained on considerable areas. Of the 3.4 million hectares of sugar beets, 1.5 million hectares have also been sown according to the industrial method. Best shoots have appeared on 3 million hectares. The tending of the beets has been well organized in Moldavia and in Belgorod Oblast.

Kuban farmers have begun tending the sugar beet areas on a mass scale. Mechanized links and detachments are performing an important agricultural task -- the thinning out of plantations. Sugar beets occupy 205,000 hectares in Krasnodar Kray. This year, Kuban farmers have planned to dispatch over 6 million tons of roots for processing.

The sowing of fodder crops continues. So far they occupy 4.4 million hectares more than by the same time last year. Perennial nonundersown grasses occupied 1.2 million hectares, undersown grasses 4.5 million hectares and annual grasses 5.2 million hectares. In the opinion of specialists, the state of grasses is quite good. Some 10 of the union republics are already carrying out their first mowing. They have been gathered on 200,000 hectares. Some 130,000 tons of haylage, 60,000 tons of hay and 4,000 tons of grass meal have been procured. On those areas where grasses have been gathered, farms are top-dressing and watering to obtain subsequent cuts more rapidly.

Work on the potato fields is proceeding at a good pace. The farmers of Belorussia, the Baltic region, the Central and Volga-Vyatka regions of the RSFSR, and the southern Urals are planting the roots on a mass scale. Kolkhozes and sovkhozes of Bryansk Oblast, which has the largest plantation of this crop in the RSFSR -- over 115,000 hectares -- have planted twice as many potatoes as by the same time last year. Here, many potato-growing collectives have gone over to the team contract method.

The fieldwork front is now extensive. The tasks are diverse. The sowing campaign is now approaching in the immense region of the east, where we have one-third of our grainfield and from which we obtain the main bulk of strong and valuable spring wheats. So far, 74.1 thousand hectares of barley have been sown in West Siberia and 18,000 hectares in East Siberia. This is a kind of exploratory exercise, a trial of strength. The main tasks on the wheatfields are still to come, but they must be finished in a very short space of time. Well, we wish the farmers of the eastern grain-producing areas success. The country hopes to obtain a good harvest here.

RSFSR Data

PM131327 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 12 May 83 First Edition p 1

["Field Work Diary" by I. Nivin: "Quality -- Under Control" -- first six paragraphs are a SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA introduction]

[Text] According to data issued by the RSFSR central Statistical Administration:

Spring crops have been sown on 39.7 million hectares, which is 49.4 percent of the planned area. This includes grain and pulse crops (excluding corn) on almost 26 million hectares.

Potatoes have been planted on 629,000 hectares.

Sugar beet (industrial) covers 1.4 million hectares, which is 92.5 percent of the planned area.

Vegetables have been sown and planted on 270,000 hectares, which is over one-half the planned areas.

The total area sown increased last week by 6.6 million hectares.

The sowing of early grain crops is basically almost completed on the farms of North Caucasus and in the central part of the republic. The sowing campaign is spreading fast toward the Eastern regions. Kolkhozes and sovkhozes in the Urals, Siberia and the Far East have stepped up their work on soil preparation, moisture retention and pre-sowing cultivation, while here and there the seeders have emerged onto the fields.

The majority of Russia's farms are in the process of sowing sunflowers. By 9 May, sunflowers had covered over 2 million hectares. This year the areas sown to millet and buckwheat have been increased by almost 100,000 hectares. The farmers are giving special attention to increasing the yields from groats.

They are faced with the task of making up the shortfalls of these crops in previous years and increasing their gross harvest.

Wherever work is now at its height, the fieldworkers must bear in mind not only the rapidity but also the quality of work. In Gorkiy Oblast specialists are carefully monitoring all sowing operations. Scientists from the local agricultural institute have determined that the graingrowers achieved low yields in the past because of inconsistency in the density of crop stand. This is why the farms are now using cross-sowing with simultaneous application of mineral fertilizers in the rows. A scientifically substantiated system of farming is being introduced in the oblast more actively than before. Effective competition has been organized. As a result of this, in the first days of May many rayons had already completed the sowing of grain crops.

About 93,000 hectares have been allocated for corn in Bryansk Oblast. This is almost a quarter of the fodder fields. Advanced technology for the cultivation of this crop is being used everywhere. Each hectare of field land receives no less than 40-50 tons of organic fertilizers, the full dosage of mineral fertilizers, and herbicides. Only seeds treated with water repellants are being planted in the soil, thus ensuring their protection against possible chilling and against diseases and pests. This year the oblast's farmers are planning to produce about 2.5 million tons of corn green matter plus the ears.

There are many examples of genuine concern for the future harvest. Nevertheless, the fieldwork operations did not start in an organized way everywhere. Many of Novgorod Oblast's farms are missing the best sowing times because of insufficiently well-prepared equipment and links. In Valdayskiy and Marevskiy Rayons, for example, spring crops have been sown on some 15 percent of the planned area in 4 days, while less than 1 percent has been sown in Volotovskiy, Poddorskiy and Starorusskiy Rayons. Lagging behind will inevitably lead to excessive haste, which will mean all kinds of defects in the fields.

The integrated performance of operations is an important condition for the proper progress of work during the busy spring period. Some crops should not be given preference at the expense of others. Meanwhile, Kalinin and Yaroslavl Oblasts delay the mass planting of potatoes, year in and year out, until they have sown the flax and the fodder crops. In the experts' opinion, each day of spring that is lost can lead to a harvest shortfall of almost a ton of tubers per hectare in the fall.

In the republic as a whole, potatoes have been planted on an area twice as large as that for the same date last year. But still some farms are insufficiently concerned about quality. The grossest violations have occurred in the Leninskaya Iskra Kolkhoz of Tambov Oblast's Morshanskiy Rayon. Untreated seed potatoes have been planted in the soil there, and many omissions have occurred in the beds [gryadki]. Here and there the defects have been corrected. But quite a few still remain. Insufficient monitoring by experts is taking its toll.

Today's busy period is a serious test for recently created agro-industrial complexes. Work is proceeding successfully wherever close cooperation has been achieved between the partners. The introduction of collective contracts has become a specific test of their earnestness, persistence and coordination. In the Chistopolskiy Rayon Agro-industrial Association of the Tatar ASSR the nonregulated teams have been provided with everything necessary for completing the entire cycle from sowing to harvesting: equipment, fertilizers and high-grade seeds. The very first weeks of spring work have mainfested the advantages of the new organization of labor.

The speed and quality of sowing work are significantly higher.

A businesslike atmosphere prevails nowadays in the rice paddies; this crop has been sown on 202,000 hectares (61 percent of the planned area). In Krasnodar Kray, 75 percent of the work has been completed, with 46 percent in Astrakhan Oblast and 54 percent in Rostov Oblast. The mowing of grasses has started in the southern regions and the cultivation of fallow lands is in progress.

To sum up, we are now at the stage when the most important agricultural operations proceed in sequence. To carry them out comprehensively; within the optimal time limits, and lay reliable foundations for the future harvest is the duty of every farmer.

HEAVY RAIN WASHES AWAY CROPS IN TAJIKISTAN

PM131135 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 May Morning Edition p 6

[V. Surkov report under the rubric "From the Scene of the Event": "In Defiance of the Elements"]

[Text] Dushanbe [no date given] -- This is now the second 10-day period that the inhabitants of a number of rayons of Tajikistan have been fighting against the onslaught of the mountain elements, which have been awakened by unprecedently heavy rain.

It all began against all expectations. Intensive spring rain began to fall, as usual, from skies thickly covered with leaden black clouds. But suddenly it turned into real rivers from the sky. This entire huge mass of water rained down upon the rock faces and was carried into the mountain valleys.

Kulyab oblast kolkhozes and sovkhozes suffered from the onslaught of the elements: A considerable proportion of the sowings of cotton and other agricultural crops was washed away.

Sowing units are once again droning in the cottonfields. More than 20,000 hectares of cotton have already been resown.

Operational headquarters to combat the elements have been set up in the oblasts and rayons, They are ensuring an efficient rhythm of reconstruction work. Republic organs are helping the local headquarters with everything necessary. An operational conference has just been held in Dushanbe and addressed by R.N. Nabiyev, first secretary of the Tajik CP Central Committee. Additional measures have been taken to assist the affected rayons.

GRISHIN ATTENDS AIR DEFENSE DISTRICT MEETING

PM130909 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 6 May 83 First Edition p 1

[Report by KRASNAYA ZVEZDA correspondent Lieutenant Colonel I. Varfolomeyev: "Analysis of Results"]

[Text] Four times in recent years the anti-aircraft missile unit commanded by Colonel V. Zhdanov; bearer of the order "For Services to the Motherland in the USSR Armed Forces," 3d Class, has been awarded a Challenge Red Banner of the Moscow CPSU Gorkom and Moscow Gorispolkom for successes in combat and political training and for scoring high indicators in socialist competition.

During the winter training period the leading collective increased its achievements. Everyone in the unit who is supposed to have a class rating has one and, furthermore, most are high-class specialists and masters of combat expertise. For many years in succession the unit has been distinguished by high standards of military discipline.

At a 5 May session of the Order of Lenin Moscow Air Defense District Military Council, this unit was again named among the winners in socialist competition. Remarkable successes were also scored by the units commanded by officers G. Gogolev; B. Novitskiy, I. Kostyunin and others.

Colonel General of Aviation A. Konstantinov, commander of the Order of Lenin Moscow Air Defense District, and Lieutenant General of Aviation V. Ponomarev, member of the Military Council and chief of the District Political Directorate, noted in their reports the need to struggle more purposefully in all subunits to fulfill the combat and political training plans, step up the introduction of leading experience, persistently increase vigilance and combat readiness, and strengthen regulation order.

Comrade V.V. Grishin, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Moscow CPSU Gorkom, addressed the Military Council session.

USTINOV, ROMANOV SIGN ADMIRAL'S OBITUARY

PM131208 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 7 May 83 First Edition p 5

[Yu A. Panteleyev Obituary]

[Excerpts] Professor Yuriy Aleksandrovich Panteleyev, admiral, retired, and participant in the Civil War and the Great Patriotic War, has died after a long illness. A true son of the Soviet people who devoted all his conscious life to selfless service to the motherland and to the cause of the Communist Party, of which he had been a member since 1940, has passed away.

Yu A. Panteleyev was born on 18 (31) October 1901 in St. Petersburg.

[Signed] D.F. Ustinov, G.V. Romanov, A.A. Yepishev, S.G. Gorshkov, A.I. Sorokin, P.N. Medvedev, N.I. Smirnov, V.N. Chernavin, G.A. Bondarenko, P.G. Kotov, G.A. Kuznetsov, L.V. Mizin, V.G. Novikov, A.M. Kosov, V.V. Sidorov, I.M. Kapitanets, N.P. Dyakonskiy, I.F. Alikov, V.A. Samoylov, V.N. Ponikarovskiy, A.I. Korniyenko, M.V. Ozimov, S.Ye. Zakharov, Ya.G. Pochupaylo, V.S. Cherokov